PROJECT MUSE®

Fairy Godfather , Fairy-Tale History, and Fairy-Tale
Scholarship: A Response to Dan Ben-Amos, Jan M. Ziolkowski,
and Francisco Vaz da Silva

Ruth B. Bottigheimer

➡ *For additional information about this article*
https://muse.jhu.edu/article/396117

RUTH B. BOTTIGHEIMER

Fairy Godfather, Fairy-Tale History, and Fairy-Tale Scholarship: A Response to Dan Ben-Amos, Jan M. Ziolkowski, and Francisco Vaz da Silva

This article is a response to criticisms of my thesis that Giovanni Francesco Straparola invented the rise fairy-tale plotline in 1550s Venice. In order to clarify and support the argument that I made in my 2002 book, Fairy Godfather, *I here make efforts toward establishing a common terminology, critiquing the parameters of Proppian structural analysis, and revising the trope of women-as-storytellers. I affirm the importance of sociohistorical studies of publishing, editing, and patterns of literacy for understanding the emergence and spread of rise fairy tales. I refute arguments for the existence of rise fairy tales in the ancient world and in the Middle Ages. In addition, I offer further explanations of how print technology, widespread schooling, and economic change brought about the emergence of rise fairy tales in Renaissance Venice, and to account for the post-1789 spread of rise fairy tales among European and non-European populations, I cite increasing literacy in rural areas.*

Origins matter. They matter regarding the evolution of humans and they matter regarding folklore. If we do not understand where things come from and the processes by which they were produced, then we create myths about them that cloak and disguise the truth. This article unapologetically discusses the origins and dissemination of the rise fairy-tale plotline so beloved in the modern world. Evidence suggests that in the 1550s, Giovanni Francesco Straparola created this plot. The rise fairy tale—with its protagonists' humble origins, their suffering the effects of poverty, their undergoing tests or tasks and surmounting trials, and with the trope of magical assistance that allows the protagonist to marry a royal personage and become rich—did not exist in popular tradition before the 1550s.

Some critics of this view say that folklore studies have turned away from inquiries into fairy tales' origins in favor of other issues. Research into origins did indeed lose its currency decades ago, plagued as it was by methodological problems—such as the fact that the majority of scholars understood their nineteenth- and twentieth-centu-

RUTH B. BOTTIGHEIMER *is a Research Professor in the Department of Comparative Literary and Cultural Studies at Stony Brook University*

ry observations of oral traditions as faithful reflections of stories that they believed had been told in the ancient and medieval worlds. For them, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century European fairy tales were expressions of an ancient oral tradition derived from peasants and nursemaids, whom scholars reflexively inserted into their folklore histories. Many scholars still hold this view. This prevailing assumption is an error that needs to be corrected.

Other critics of my thesis say that plots similar to those of Straparola's rise fairy tales existed in earlier centuries. However, no scholar to date has documented the existence of ancient or medieval rise fairy tales as Straparola created them. Not only were Straparola's rise fairy tales' ragged and sometimes repellent swains and sweethearts new in their day (as I will discuss in detail below), but they survived over centuries and became the template for numerous new tales in the modern world. We need to take notice of the rise fairy tale as a new phenomenon in the 1550s and try to account for it.

The dissemination of rise fairy tales in the early modern period is the focus of my critics' third objection. It is hard to believe that rise fairy tales' detailed narratives survived intact and unchanged over several tale generations, not to mention centuries of oral retellings; the narratives would have disintegrated, a concern expressed by folktale collectors since the Grimm brothers and commented on by Viktor Shklovsky (cited in Burke [1978] 2009:187). Increasingly, research (mine as well as that of numerous other scholars) suggests that printed literature provided the public with repeated, invariant retellings. Here, I make this argument exclusively for the plotline of rise fairy tales. If my hypothesis is correct for rise fairy tales, future scholars may wish to test it against other popular plotlines.

In *Fairy Tales: A New History* (2009a), I have suggested that the initial success of rise fairy tales can be attributed to the way in which they complemented literate workers' experiences in the sixteenth century, including their increasingly urban lives and their participation in a money economy. Over time, rise fairy tales' cast of characters changed from poor urban protagonists to impoverished rural heroes and heroines. With their accounts of dramatic improvements in earthly fortunes, rise fairy tales remain popular in the contemporary world, appealing to readers, listeners, and viewers alike.

Identifying a point at which rise fairy tales appeared implies that there was a previous time in which they did not exist. In his article in this issue of the *Journal of American Folklore*, Dan Ben-Amos asserts that something like the rise fairy tale emerged in medieval Jewish homiletics; but if that is so, then why, among all of the brief medieval narrative forms that we now know to have existed, did that plot not take hold until the 1550s? In the medieval Christian West, the dominant plotlines of the brief narratives that involved poor or weak protagonists made use of religion-based interventions (as in Marian legends), and they described protagonists who had to be made into model noble suitors *before* they could approach a princess (such as the hero of *Lionbruno*; see Cirino of Ancona [1470] 1976). This is not the case in Straparola's rise fairy tales, in which a still ragged and filthy Pietro Pazzo could go off with a royal daughter after receiving magical power from a talking tuna.

Tales like Straparola's "Pietro Pazzo" and "Costantino Fotunato" did not exist in the medieval period, but they flowered throughout Europe in the early modern and

modern periods.[1] What does it mean when a new plot takes hold in the cultural marketplace? It means that something culturally significant has shifted. Establishing ending points (for the production and consumption of Marian legends, for instance) and beginning points (for the composition of rise fairy tales) helps us to identify changes in community-wide attitudes, including the way ordinary people viewed their lives and their surroundings. This subject is an important focus for folklorists and social historians.

Rise fairy tales are a product of that quintessential engine of modernity, the printing press. To be profitable, the capital-intensive print shop required a mass market, and a mass market required reading matter that complemented a popular worldview. Across Europe in the sixteenth century, prodigious creatures and events stalked the broadsheets, as Rudolf Schenda pointed out in *Die französische Prodigienliteratur* (The French literature of prodigious creatures and events) (1961). Magic as fantasy, evident in rise and restoration fairy tales, was one cut above, eschewing natural disasters in favor of the astonishing acts and magical paraphernalia familiar from contemporary romances.

My critics take exception to my twin contentions that rise fairy tales, first, did not originally spring from the folk and, second, cannot be shown to have been disseminated in a continuous oral tradition by the folk before the nineteenth century. I accept that the folk (whether defined as simple country people or as contemporary urban dwellers) were, and are, perfectly capable of creating new rise tales, once the template for such tales was in place. Later nineteenth-century documentation of oral variants of prior printed tales makes that clear. However, it is a different question altogether as to whether or not the folk created the rise fairy tale template in the first place. I believe that they did not.

The handful of rise fairy tales that appeared in Straparola's *Le piacevoli notti* (Pleasant nights; published in 1551 and 1553 and reprinted in 2000) established the new plot and placed their protagonists' poverty at the center of the narrative. Straparola emphasized that his character Pietro Pazzo (night 3, story 1) was the son of a widow so poor she could barely keep "body and soul together" ([1551–1553] 1898, vol. 1:243), that Adamantina's mother (night 5, story 2) was "miserably poor" and lacked every domestic comfort (vol. 2:178), and that Costantino Fortunato (night 11, story 1) rose "from being little better than a beggar [to] the full dignity of a king" (vol. 4:6). Straparola's comments about poverty demonstrate that his formulation of an ascent to wealth powered by a magically mediated marriage to royalty was a conscious choice. He was writing in Renaissance Venice, where a legal marriage between commoners and nobles was forbidden by statute and where a marriage between an heir and an urchin was patently impossible (Chojnacki 2000:53–75). The introduction of magic was thus a critical element for fantasies of class-leaping weddings. This trajectory of poverty–magic–marriage–money simply was not part of the European cultural or literary landscape before the mid-1500s.[2] In his article in this issue Ben-Amos identifies one apparently similar plot in the medieval era, embedded in a religious context, but Straparola's rise fairy tales differ in that they are fundamentally and characteristically secular narratives with worldly aspirations rather than religious tales with God at their core.

Another, related kind of fairy tale, the restoration fairy tale, also appears in *Le piacevoli notti*. Its outlines are familiar from the world of medieval and early modern romances. Multi-episodic romances had royal heroes or heroines who left home, suffered trials, undertook adventures, and finally—with the help of magic objects, supernatural figures, or fairies—married back into royal ranks, which restored them to royal estate and privilege. Romances like these, with their extensible plots, were legion. In Straparola's time hack writers composed ever new sequels, prequels, and variations to existing romances.[3] Straparola moved in an opposite direction. Instead of adding further episodes to romance plots, he abbreviated these plots into tales of heroes' and heroines' expulsions from their natal palaces: Prince Livoretto left Tunis because in his ancestral kingdom sons could not inherit the throne (night 3, story 2); a stepmother-in-law's enmity drove out Queen Biancabella (night 3, story 3); and Prince Guerrino fled from paternal wrath (night 5, story 1). Straparola's restoration fairy tales always end happily with a fairy-tale wedding, as do his rise fairy tales. This marks another divergence from the romances of his day, some of which strike modern readers as ending on a distinctly miserable note. For example, some chivalric romances from Straparola's time end with their heroes rejecting marriage and embracing a hermit's life. Such an ending can be seen in the popular story of Robert the Devil, which circulated widely in Italy as a sermon tale in the early modern period.[4]

Straparola's rise and restoration fairy tales differ from each other in three respects: First, the restoration fairy tales are consistently longer than the rise fairy tales. Second, the heroes and heroines of the restoration fairy tales manipulate magic actively, while those of the rise fairy tales experience magic passively. Finally, the protagonists of the restoration fairy tales are princes and princesses of privilege and wealth, while those of the rise fairy tales are ordinary, impoverished boys and girls.[5]

The other articles in this issue exemplify scholarship in folkloristics (Dan Ben-Amos and Francisco Vaz da Silva) and comparative literature (Jan M. Ziolkowski). Ben-Amos assesses my stance in *Fairy Godfather* as a challenge to generations of fairy-tale scholars, and he introduces a variety of ancient and medieval tales as evidence against my argument that rise fairy tales originated in sixteenth-century Venice. Ziolkowski likewise uses historically datable tales to counter the assertion that Straparola invented rise fairy tales. Vaz da Silva posits oralist views and Proppian analyses. Although Ben-Amos, Ziolkowski, and Vaz da Silva approach the dating of the first rise fairy tales from different directions, they agree in opposing *Fairy Godfather*'s conclusions and in rejecting the theoretical route by which those conclusions were reached. In the following pages, I will summarize my approach, analyze my colleagues' evidence, and weigh probability and logic against their claims regarding the presence of rise fairy tales in oral tradition before Straparola's time.

Parameters of the Current Discussion

Much of the dispute about print- and publishing-based fairy-tale studies grows from differing understandings of four questions fundamental to the study of fairy tales in historical context. What constitutes a "tale"? Which has primacy, theories about tales or the tales themselves? What constitutes evidence in discussions about early modern

fairy tales? What is a "fairy tale"? Recent discussions of these questions have been marked by contentiousness, and so I will aim for a sober and balanced treatment.

These four questions seem basic, and we might expect the majority of folk-narrative scholars to agree in their answers or at least to have significantly overlapping responses. But this is often not the case. Scholars generally have strongly held but unarticulated positions about each of these questions, positions that inform their thinking in fundamental, and sometimes fundamentally differing, ways. The three preceding articles in this issue provide examples of such differing assumptions. None of these authors states a position about such questions explicitly; nor, at first glance, would it seem necessary that they do so. Individually, their positions mirror assumptions shared by many of their colleagues. But in some respects their assumptions coexist uncomfortably, and it is not surprising that a good many of their premises also contrast sharply with those on which my work rests (see Bottigheimer 1989a, 1999, 2002b, 2003a, 2003b, 2004a, 2004b, and 2009a). I will discuss these differing assumptions in detail in the following sections and then continue by exploring a range of issues that stem from these basic assumptions.

An initial clarification of positions taken in *Fairy Godfather* will, I hope, help to establish a set of mutually comprehensible reference points. The absence of shared definitions, or a "lack of uniform terminology," as described by Joav Elstein and Avidov Lipsker (2004:8–9), fosters a tendency for folk-narrative scholars to talk past one another and leads inevitably to confusion and misunderstanding. So let us explore possible responses to the four questions above with plain speech, common sense, and good will. Let us also consider the ways in which theoretical positions affect assumptions in fairy-tale studies and examine the kinds of arguments that grow from conflicts among differing theoretical positions.

What Constitutes A "Tale"?

Attempts to define tales (*Märchen*) have been recognized as "sporadic" (Georges and Jones 1995:102) and inconclusive (Dundes 1964b:252). In his classic 1965 piece on prose narratives, William Bascom recognized that "folktale" is a "loosely used" term (3). More than thirty years later, the problem of defining genres had not changed: in their 1999 article, "'The Foundation of All Future Researches': Franz Boas, George Hunt, Native American Texts, and the Construction of Modernity," Charles Briggs and Richard Bauman called for the establishment of genre terms that would provide "clear, consistent modes of classification" that were free of "overlap, residue, or slippage" (507). The following year, Américo Paredes reiterated his 1972 criticism in the foreword to *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore*, noting that folklorists' inability to agree on basic definitions leads to theoretical confusions that impede discussion—a concern that had remained unchanged from the original date of this foreword to the time of its 2000 reprint (Paredes and Bauman [1972] 2000:ix). To this day, a flawed terminological shorthand continues to hamper the communication of basic concepts about folk and fairy tales as they are listed in the ATU tale-type index. Let us begin, therefore, by making an effort to arrive at a set of mutually acceptable descriptions of "tales" and of "fairy tales."

Measuring tales by the degree of interactivity between performer and audience, Roger Abrahams positioned the narrative forms that include Märchen in a middle ground between interactive genres (such as cante fables and catch tales) and static genres (such as folk painting and sculpture) (1976, fig. 1 opposite page 206). With reference to "conflict" and "resolution of conflict," Abrahams located Märchen closer to resolution (fig. 2 opposite page 207). The length of Märchen is also significant; their brevity locates them among a range of short narrative forms toward one end of a continuum, with longer novellas toward the other end. (Within this general categorization, however, tales may vary considerably, with some being nearly as long as short novellas). One feature that links all of these measures is their common recognition of a tale's relative rather than absolute position within a continuum of narrative or communicative forms.

In the early modern period a large number of communicative forms were composed or compiled in verse, with lengthy romances as well as some brief tales versified well into the seventeenth century. But in the modern world, tales are distinguished by their prose form, and this is how William Bascom classically defined them (1965:4). Another major aspect of Märchen is that they involve protagonists who show recognizably human qualities. Even if one of the protagonists is a rock in the road or a tree by the wayside, it speaks, reacts, and moves a plot forward in the same way that interactions between human protagonists do. Such tales are also action-packed, with few words devoted to personal characteristics, landscape descriptions, or interior monologues. Finally, in their structure tales have relatively brief beginnings, middles, and endings. The weighting of their tripartite division distinguishes a tale from a fable, which passes speedily and almost imperceptibly through its middle to abruptly achieve a more fully developed ending, which is generally formulated as a moral lesson.

Historically, many tales do not stand alone but are embedded within a larger narrative. The embedding of tales has been studied as a historical phenomenon (Gittes 1983, 1991), as a literary category (Barth 1984:225–32), as a device for aesthetic fantasy (Barth 1984:223–4), as a structuring maneuver (Gittes 1991; Barth 1984:226; Belcher 1994; Douglas 2007; Haring 2004, 2007), as a parasitic genre (Haring 2004:230–1), as metaphysical metatextuality (Frow 2007), as a bridge between oral and literate traditions (Irwin 1995), and as evidence for change in the concept of a frame (Belcher 1994). Scholarship on the relationship between a framed story and the frame-tale situation includes discussions by John Barth (1984:232–3), Jerome Clinton (1986), and Lee Haring (2007:137).

One aspect of framed tales remains largely unexplored: the fictive identity of the narrator of a secondarily (or tertiarily, etc.) embedded tale can condition the way in which listeners and readers understand the tales told by those narrators. Nonetheless, scholarly discussions of narratorial identity in *Thousand and One Nights*, for example, generally go no further than an analysis of Shahrazad's position as ultimate narrator for all the tales within the overarching frame story. However, a large number of subsidiary narrators are built into *Thousand and One Nights*, and they voice many of *Nights*' individual tales. Their identities are significant, precisely because a narrator's role within the overall narrative construct can and often does affect how listeners

(and readers) understand that narrator's tale. The question of *who* tells a tale is as meaningful as the stated purpose or the explicit meaning of the tale.

Regarding the identification of particular tales, it is remarkable how frequently a tale is defined by constituent motifs (for example, the presence of a small shoe regularly connotes a "Cinderella" tale). But using motifs as pointers toward a tale type occasionally leads a discussion astray. The motif of a cat who brings riches, for example, which was used by Straparola in "Costantino Fortunato" (night 11, story 1), antedated his composition of that tale: the same motif appears in Nicholas de Troyes's *Le grand Parangon des nouvelles nouvelles* ([1518] 1970, story 28). With that preexisting cat, Straparola need not have written a rise fairy tale; he could have composed a legend about how a particular family obtained its wealth. But Straparola didn't do that. Instead, he wrote about a fairy cat that raised her raggedy and filthy master from poverty-stricken misery to velvet-clad handsomeness and castle regency.

The same motif (a cat and a rise to wealth) can clearly propel two very different kinds of narrative (legend and rise fairy tale) into being. That is no surprise, as is repeatedly exemplified in Thompson's motif index, but it needs to be spelled out, because some motifs are misleadingly connotative. A small shoe that fits only its owner's foot, for instance, has come to define a "Cinderella" tale, and in his article in this issue Ben-Amos draws on this traditional relationship between the shoe and "Cinderella" to argue that Strabo's two-thousand-year-old tale of the courtesan Rhodopis was a modern rags-to-riches "Cinderella" tale (that is, that Strabo's tale is the equivalent of the tale in its post-1789 rise form). However, Rhodopis's shoe, dropped by an eagle into a pharaoh's lap, wasn't small, or at least, Strabo doesn't say it was (1915:250–2). Nor did it need to be small, because in natural, iconographic, and fictional worlds the eagle is well known as a mighty bird that routinely carried off animals, both large and small, to feed its young. In Strabo's account, the marvel was not the shoe's smallness but the eagle's accurate aim. Dropping a shoe into a pharaoh's lap was clearly something extraordinary, and we would do well to heed the scholar of ancient manuscripts Wolfgang Wettengel (2006), who warns against leaping to the conclusion that a modern fairy tale existed in the distant past just because a motif familiar from more recent fairy tales was also present then.[6] We might also heed Elstein and Lipsker's discussion of thematology, with its emphasis on studying whole narratives in their historical context in order to understand the function of individual motifs within those tales (2004:1–2, 5).

But what of the poor heroine Rhodopis who marries a pharaoh? Does she not experience a rise? That question requires further discussion, because Strabo's courtesan Rhodopis has little in common with the suffering associated with most modern sex workers. A "courtesan" in the ancient world, as Strabo explicitly identifies Rhodopis, was a well-informed public woman, whose marketable skills included political knowledge and lively wit as well as sex. Courtesans in the ancient world purveyed all of these skills (in individually differing proportions), often in luxurious surroundings. Instead of denoting a "poor heroine" consistent with the pattern of a rise fairy tale, Rhodopis's profession thus places her within an ancient grouping of often beautiful and always savvy women who lived outside and beyond conventional social strictures. Shoe or not, Rhodopis's story is no "Cinderella" tale.

When Ben-Amos goes on to reason that the sacralized status of ancient Egyptian cats is relevant to "Costantino Fortunato," a different kind of historical problem intrudes. The timeless present engendered by an ahistorical approach to fairy tales renders insignificant the date at which "Costantino Fortunato" first appeared in print, because an ahistorical framework assumes that the "Costantino Fortunato" fairy tale had existed ever since cats were thematized and sacralized in ancient Egypt. (I purposely overstate the case in order to stimulate reflection on the subject.) Even within a more narrow time frame, folklorists, historians, and literary critics often refer to "the French (or Italian, or German) fairy tale," when in fact they mean to indicate tales collected in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in one or the other of those countries or, alternatively, when they mean to indicate tales written in the sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth centuries in one or the other of those countries. Because the more recent fairy tales often differ in language and sometimes in plot from their sixteenth- and seventeenth-century ancestor forms, it would be more accurate to specify at least the century and the language to which the tales in question belong. By omitting dates in his discussion of "Costantino Fortunato," Ben-Amos communicates a belief in unchanging and ever-present national bodies of tales. Folklorists need to acknowledge that their use of unspecified phrasing with reference to fairy tales itself strongly implies continuous and invariant oral tradition.

Even if we reject the idea that the plot of "Costantino Fortunato" goes back to the time of Egyptian cat worship, there seem to be few folklorists who are willing to seriously entertain the possibility that the rise fairy tale "Costantino Fortunato" did not exist before Straparola's *Le piacevoli notti*. Many folklorists are unwilling to entertain the possibility that there was a historical period when a listenership would not (or could not) accept a plot in which a poor boy, through magic, marries a princess and lives happily ever after. And yet, it is possible, even likely, that in many past communities and social orderings this notion was such a rank impossibility that nobody would think of telling a tale with such a plot—or if they did tell such a tale, it would not survive. This view offers a potential explanation for the absence of rise fairy tales from the record before the 1550s, and it is consistent with Roman Jakobson and Petr Bogatyrev's observation, cited by Vaz da Silva in this issue, that a "work only becomes a fact of folklore once it has been accepted by the community" ([1929] 1982:37). At another, later, historical moment, a rise fairy tale *could* be presented and could live on, not because people believed that the events described in rise fairy tales were likely to happen, but because a different set of social circumstances allowed them to view such a plot as a plausible basis for a good tale.

A story, Eliot Oring observes, is "an experience transformed into a verbal account" (1986:121). Let us expand on this for a moment and consider that the experience of dealing with an urban money economy differs profoundly from that of living within an agrarian barter economy (while recognizing that urban and agrarian economies are rarely purely one or the other). Upward financial mobility in an urban setting is primarily money-based, as are the happy endings of Straparola's rise fairy tales. It stands to reason that the money-based wealth of the urban setting has to be experienced, or observed, before a narrative can memorialize that experience ("commemorate" is Oring's word), even if that tale is a fiction or a fantasy. Above all, and in

contrast to most medieval tales, folktales are "not sacred" (Oring 1986:126)—that is, a folktale differs fundamentally from a narrative that grows out of religious belief and experience. I think that Oring hits the nail on the head; I would only expand on his definition of "folk narrative." For Oring, such narratives "circulate primarily in oral tradition and are communicated face-to-face" (123), whereas I allow print circulation to play a major role in bringing narratives to the folk. I will not attempt further discussion at this point in regard to *why* a particular plot fails to materialize in one age and prospers in another, but it is worth acknowledging the fact that some tales apparently *do not* materialize or flourish in one age but *do* flourish in another age. What is seen to be a good tale, as evidenced by its coming into existence and then surviving and spreading, changes from one age to another.

All of the tale parameters discussed in this section are also operative in the analysis of Straparola's narratives in *Fairy Godfather*. In addition, the distinctions made there between rise and restoration fairy tales rely on a tale's cast of characters, its constituent events, the order in which those events take place, and a tale's outcome. It is not just a motif (such as a single shoe or a singular cat) that determines when a particular tale (in this case, a rise fairy tale) becomes historically recognizable but also who does what, what happens to whom, and how it all ends.

Which Comes First: Theories or Tales?

For millennia, people have told stories about characters who ranged from gods and goddesses to next-door neighbors. People have also told stories about how the moon got into the sky, how a silly peasant subverted his chance to become rich, how the Virgin Mary saved an incestuous murderess from the Devil's clutches, and how a dog kept a cow away from its manger. At a much later date, scholars started parsing these thousands of stories and dividing them into genres such as myth, anecdote, gossip, etiology, folk tale, fairy tale, religious legend, and fable. Theories categorize and regularize tales' dizzying variety, and audiences have always interpreted narratives through the lens of local ideas about what is appropriate for the telling of tales. Nonetheless, it seems clear that actual tales must precede theories about tales.

In spite of this, both Ben-Amos and Vaz da Silva advance arguments in this issue that rest on the premise that theories take precedence over tales. For instance, Ben-Amos, turning to the Grimms' discussion of the historical and localizable nature of legends, reasons that the distinctive nature of "Dick Whittington and His Cat" grows from its genre (legend). But surely it was the other way around: the author of the "Whittington's Cat" tale that Ben-Amos discusses accounted for what happened in Dick Whittington's life in legend form, rather than in a rise fairy-tale form, because it made sense to do so in the sociohistorical context in which he set out the narrative—*not* because the early-seventeenth-century writers of the earliest versions of the Dick Whittington tale decided to embody legend tenets in their narratives.[7]

Privileging tale theory over tales themselves has serious consequences for the analysis of tale content. Because the socioeconomic and sociocultural categories I use to analyze rise and restoration fairy tales go beyond Vladimir Propp's ([1928] 1958) structural approach, Vaz da Silva calls my distinction between rise and resto-

ration fairy tales "specious" (410) and "irrelevant" (411). This is despite the fact that sociocultural textual analyses are well established in narrative studies (Hanks 1989). Vaz da Silva's dismissal implies that Propp's theory represents a final theoretical stage beyond which it is impossible to proceed. Consider, however, that Propp's fairy-tale theory grew out of his study of Aleksandr Nikolayevich Afanas'ev's nineteenth-century collection of Russian tales (Afanas'ev [1855–1863] 1975), a collection for which Propp's theory is brilliantly useful. Adapted into a broad range of scholarship,[8] Proppian structural theory—systematizing *what* happens, the *order* in which events take place, and *who* performs various actions—opens insights into modern (post-1789) fairy tales. However, Propp's "who" is categorical (e.g., "hero") rather than personal ("poor boy" or "prince"), and it is defined without reference to sociocultural issues. In particular, his system does not, and cannot, address the social and economic distinctions that are found in Straparola's sixteenth-century Italian fairy tales.[9]

What might Propp's analytic system have looked like had he addressed Straparola's mid-sixteenth-century Italian tales instead of Afanas'ev's late-nineteenth-century Russian ones? Perhaps he would have recognized distinctive differences between tales that had princes and princesses as protagonists and ones that slotted poor girls and poor boys into major roles. Perhaps Propp would have responded to other aspects of Straparola's tales altogether, given his lifelong interest in interpreting fairy tales as ritual in the tradition of Pierre Saintyves and James Frazer (see Voigt 2002, col. 1436–7; Pöge-Alder 2007:201). But we cannot know what Propp might have done if he had taken Straparola's fairy tales as his point of reference in developing his structural theory, because he chose to work with nineteenth-century Russian tales and not with sixteenth-century Straparolean ones. Since no earlier theoretician had developed a perspective that illuminates the novel aspects of Straparola's sixteenth-century Venetian tales, I worked out categories that address meaningful issues within the context of those tales, and in so doing, I extended the boundaries set by Propp.

What Constitutes Evidence in Discussing Fairy Tales in a Historical Context?

The most palpable difference between my approach and many folklorists' thinking about fairy tales is in the arena of concrete evidence and its significance within historical inquiries. Disproving my conclusion that rise fairy tales did not exist before the 1550s is a straightforward undertaking that requires only one thing: producing examples of rise fairy tales in prior centuries.

Let us move backward in time, era by era. Historical sources for pre-1551 *tales* are legion. Thousands of imprints of early (1450s to 1550) Italian brief narratives of every imaginable kind exist in the Herzog August Library in Wolfenbüttel (many of these are collected in Lommatzsch 1950–1951). However, not a single rise fairy tale can be found among them. Neither is there a single rise fairy tale before 1550 in printed German-language tale collections. Nor are rise fairy tales to be found in French, Spanish, Portuguese, or English tale collections printed before 1550.

Going back further, before Gutenberg's printing press, dozens of Italian, French, German, Spanish, and English tale collections, both secular and religious, were com-

piled, sold, and circulated in manuscript. Ben-Amos (429) offers a representative listing of the many that were edited and republished in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such as those by Giovanni Sercambi, Girolamo Parabosco, and Girolomo Morlini. As is the case in the first hundred years of print, tales of all kinds are represented in these manuscript collections, but one searches in vain for a tale in which a poor boy or girl suffers tasks and trials, marries royalty through the aid of magic, and becomes rich here on earth. Nor is there a single example of that plotline in any medieval sermon tale, Marian miracle tale, or secular *fabliau* tale (see Berlioz, Brémond, and Velay-Vallantin 1989; Polo de Beaulieu 1992). Albert Wesselski's *Märchen des Mittelalters* (Tales of the Middle Ages) (1925), Hans-Jörg Uther's *Märchen vor Grimm* (Tales before Grimm) (1990), and Ziolkowski's *Fairy Tales from Before Fairy Tales* (2007) all provide rich collections of Märchen from the ancient world and the Middle Ages, while William Hansen's *Ariadne's Thread: A Guide to International Tales Found in Classical Literature* (2002) is, as its title states, a (highly useful) guide to international tales in the ancient world. Ziolkowski names two additional compendia, Rhys Carpenter's *Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics* (1946) and Graham Anderson's *Fairytale in the Ancient World* (2000). In none of these studies is there a single rise fairy tale like those that Straparola wrote, with poor heroes or heroines who through magic marry royalty and thereby become wealthy.

Motifs that appear in early modern rise fairy tales abound in the ancient world. That is, however, as far as we can go. A motif is not the equivalent of a tale, as has been discussed above. Nor is the recurrence of ancient motifs in early modern writings proof of a continuous oral tradition, since it can be reasonably hypothesized that the use of motifs found in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* owes much to the pervasive use of that text (in Latin or in translations into French, Italian, or English) in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century schooling (Kugler 2002:460).[10] Similarly, other ancient texts that appear to have influenced the contents of early modern fairy tales can be shown to have been translated into the vernacular in the early modern period. Heliodorus's *Aethiopica*, for example, was translated into French in 1547 and was reworked by the Neapolitan Giambattista Basile three generations later (Basile 1637).

Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Middle Eastern storytelling occasioned tales such as those that can be found in Ulrich Marzolph's collection, *Das Buch der wundersamen Geschichten* (The book of wondrous histories) (1999), and here we again search in vain for rise fairy tales. The vast holdings of Middle Eastern libraries contain many still-unpublished and still-unanalyzed manuscripts, any of which potentially harbors a rise fairy tale, but, in fact, no rise fairy tales have yet turned up from those collections. As far as *evidence* goes, then, there is currently a glaring absence of proof for the popular existence or oral performance of rise fairy tales before the 1550s, the point at which Straparola introduced them in *Le piacevoli notti*.

In outlining his disagreement with the proposition that Straparola is responsible for producing the first rise fairy tales, Vaz da Silva diverges sharply from a historical approach. For example, he finds tale variants of ATU 545B ("Puss in Boots") all over "the Indo-European world," as well as in Siberia and other non-European locations (416). Although they were not collected until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, these variants constitute Vaz da Silva's proof that rise fairy tales existed before Strap-

arola published them in the 1550s. Few modern scholars would accept nineteenth- or twentieth-century French (or German, Upper Lusatian, Norwegian, Sicilian, Siberian, Breton, etc.) fairy tales as valid evidence for the existence of those same tales in the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries. But Vaz da Silva does so. He does not openly acknowledge the premise of an invariant oral tradition as the bedrock of his reasoning, but it is the only precondition that logically accounts for his assertions that the nineteenth- or twentieth-century existence of a tale proves that it existed in identical form before the 1550s. I do not agree with that reasoning.[11]

Vaz da Silva's assumption that the nineteenth- and twentieth-century presence of rise fairy tales in numerous European locations represents an end point in a centuries- or millennia-long process of oral transmission of those same tales, in those same locations, preserved from the pre-print era, is a proposition without foundation. In contrast, both logic and history suggest that the absence of documentary evidence about oral tellings of rise fairy tales before the 1550s is an indication of a real absence and that, once oral tellings of rise fairy tales began to take place, they were noted. An instructive sequence of this sort occurred in India. Theodor Benfey, a prominent early-nineteenth-century advocate for the Indic origins of European tales, found no evidence of "Puss in Boots" on the Indian subcontinent. In 1876, a later scholar named Emmanuel Cosquin confirmed this conclusion. (The findings of both scholars are discussed in Lang 1888:lxxv.) If Benfey, an exhaustively thorough scholar with a vested interest in Indic origins, was unable to find any evidence of "Puss in Boots" in nineteenth-century India, then it is probably safe to accept his, and Emmanuel Cosquin's, conclusions. Shortly afterward, however, in 1883, the Reverend Lal Behari Day published "The Match-Making Jackal" in his *Folk Tales of Bengal*; this was a "Puss in Boots" tale-type that had characters and situations compatible with traditional Indian narratives. (Day's version of the tale was also tinged with restoration fairy-tale characteristics; that is, the poor protagonist's family had formerly been wealthy.) Andrew Lang sensibly stated that Reverend Day's discussion of this tale was a "failure" in its attempt to present an ancient (and in this case, Indian) origin for "Puss in Boots," because Reverend Day's version of the tale was the only one that existed in the India of his time (Lang 1888:lxxix). Since no "Puss in Boots" tales were found in India prior to Day's version, everything points to his having fashioned a "Puss in Boots" in jackal form for an Indian audience. After Day's time, additional Indian versions of this story began to appear; in some of these the jackal was normed back into a cat (e.g., French 1998). Further examples of this kind of literary dissemination can be found: Washington Irving, for instance, took a variety of narratives from European literary sources and refashioned them in popular forms, which were then translated back into European languages and subsequently entered far-ranging narrative traditions from America to Russia (Bottigheimer 1993a).

It is the systematic omission of chronological information that allows Vaz da Silva to present "oral tradition" as a timeless process. Avoiding the nineteenth-century date of the oral tradition to which he refers enables him to formulate an incomplete statement (of the oral presence of a tale in a particular region) as a generalization that is presented as being valid for all time. To make it appear that Perrault depended on folk oral tradition for "Le chat botté" (Puss in boots) in the 1690s, Vaz da Silva avoids

acknowledging that the only known oral tradition for "Puss in Boots" in France was documented *after* nineteenth-century schools (with their memorization-based learning) and nineteenth-century commercial channels (with their multiply produced identical texts) had familiarized large numbers of nineteenth-century learners, listeners, and readers with literary fairy tales, including "Puss in Boots."[12]

The effect of printing and publishing on oral tradition in Europe in the early modern and modern periods is being increasingly documented. A growing body of evidence demonstrates the vigorous European publishing of rise fairy tales throughout Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and thus it illuminates the widespread presence of rise fairy tales in those geographic areas at roughly the same time. In this context, it is of little surprise that nineteenth- and twentieth-century European collectors who scoured the countryside in search of authentic folk narrative were abundantly rewarded. One important print source for folk knowledge of fairy tales lies in nineteenth- and twentieth-century newspapers, about whose role in fairy-tale dissemination little was known until relatively recently. The fairy-tale texts that newspapers produced for their readers frequently became a source for nineteenth- and twentieth-century oral storytelling, particularly since newspapers were read by schoolteachers, schoolchildren, the barely literate, and the marginally literate, among others. Niklaus R. Schweizer (1988) and Cristina Bacchilega and Noelani Arista (2004) have shown that newspaper circulation was the basis of an uncanny resemblance of tales collected in Hawaiʻi in the 1860s and 1870s to the Grimms' "Twelve Brothers," *Thousand and One Nights*, and the tales of "Snow White" and "Bluebeard"—all of which had been translated into Hawaiian and published in Hawaiian-language newspapers (see also Sumpter 2008:24–5; Kuwada 2009). Caroline Sumpter (2008, ch. 1) and Brian Earl (1992–1993) have investigated a similar phenomenon in Ireland, while Satu Apo (2007) has studied the relationship between newly printed fairy tales in Finland and their subsequent existence in oral tradition. Sumpter observes that folklorists found it difficult to countenance the notion that the press could shape oral tradition rather than merely recording it (2008:25).

The phenomenon of newspaper dissemination of popular tales was hardly new in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The weekly paper called *Churchman's Last Shift* entertained its English-language readers with Sindbad's voyages in 1720, and *Parker's London News* spread stories from *Thousand and One Nights* thrice weekly from 1723 to 1726. The *Universal Spectator* likewise began serializing Mlle Lhéritier's "Adventures of Finette" in 1743. Newspapers' growing circulation rates underscore the effectiveness of the periodical press as a disseminator of popular tales: circulation in England doubled between 1753 and 1792 and doubled once again between 1800 and 1830, reaching ever further into the reading population (Sumpter 2008:14–6). Vaz da Silva does not acknowledge or deal with such evidence. Consequently, his conception of a nineteenth- and twentieth-century rise fairy tale collected in the field as proof for that tale's centuries-long existence in far-flung corners of Europe and Asia is a position formed in a historical vacuum, and it can only be viewed with skepticism.

Vaz da Silva accepts the fact that there is no documentary evidence for rise fairy tales before 1551, but he then defines that documentary absence as an oral presence—that is, as evidence that there was an oral rather than a literary storytelling tradition

(404). For Ben-Amos the same assumption hovers in the background as a working hypothesis, but he does not rely on it to develop his argument. Ziolkowski's text-based scholarship shares the same bias, because for him the absence of rise fairy tales from the documentary record is an indication of lost medieval or ancient texts. Ziolkowski (390) accepts Johannes Bolte and Jiří Polívka's expansive references to early "tellings" ([1913–1932] 1963, vol. 4:41–94) as documentary evidence of actual oral tellings, even though Bolte and Polívka typically accept a nonspecific literary phrase such as "*aniles veteranarum fabula*" (the kind of story told by old women) as specific proof for folk tellings of *fairy* tales of any and every sort, including "Cinderella" or "Puss in Boots" fairy tales. I, on the other hand, do not impute a presence when the historical record is silent—that is, where there is no report of a rise fairy tale having been told or where there is no record of the tale itself.

Except for rise fairy tales, every brief narrative genre known in the ancient, medieval, or early modern Western tradition exists as a text—as a direct report of a tale that has been told or as an indirect reference to such a tale. All of these brief narrative forms either have been recorded as a complete narrative or are referred to *in extenso*, so that it is possible to identify their plots and characters. Against a background of multiply confirmed tellings of other kinds of tales, and none of a rise fairy tale, it defies probability that numberless rise fairy tales existed unnoticed and unmentioned in the ancient world, the medieval world, and the first decades of the early modern world. Such a situation would require that time after time rise fairy tales, and only rise fairy tales, escaped notation or reference by the legions of chroniclers, diarists, letter writers, dramatists, novelists, and romancers who scribbled their way from ancient Greece to Renaissance Venice. So focused and singular an exclusion runs counter to logic and probability. Why then do many people believe so strongly that rise fairy tales existed in oral form among unlettered people in the ancient world, the Middle Ages, and before Straparola in the early modern period? It may well be because Wilhelm Grimm propounded that concept at the very inception of folk-narrative studies, even though he was unable to document a pre-Straparola existence of the kinds of Märchen that I call rise fairy tales (see Bottigheimer 2009a, ch. 2).

In response to the absence of recorded rise fairy tales before 1551, folklorists have speculated about where rise fairy tales *might* have been. The reasoning goes something like this: because there were storytellers, there must have been rise fairy tales. Ben-Amos notes that "[o]ral narrators and singers performed them [oral narratives] in homes, halls, marketplaces, coffeehouses, and local festivals" (441). Nobody would fault this statement. Stories were obviously told in all of these places. But *what* stories were told? *Where* are the rise fairy tales among pre-1551 stories? They are not, for example, to be found in the *Hikayat*, a great Byzantine compendium of verifiably early date (see Marzolph 1999).[13] Ziolkowski appears to believe that there must have been rise fairy tales in the ancient world, but the most we know about the content of the tales told by the old women whom Plato, Horace, and Philostratus held in contempt (as Ziolkoski discusses) was that the old ladies frightened children into obedience by telling them warning tales about gorgons, lamia, giants, and the queen of the Laestragonians. None of these stories call to mind the parameters of the rise fairy-tale plot.

What the preceding discussion shows is that standards for historical evidence long used in the study of fairy tales are contradictory to the standards for historical evidence in other contemporary disciplines in the social sciences. It is still seen as acceptable to take absent documentary evidence as proof for the oral presence of rise fairy tales. But might it not also be the case that absent evidence is just that: no evidence, and hence an unacceptable basis for proof?

What is a Fairy Tale?

Simple terminological confusions have repeatedly muddied discussions about fairy tales, and the most prominent of these is the common interchange of the terms "folktale" and "fairy tale."[14] This slippage is firmly anchored in the standard tale-type reference work, the Aarne-Thompson-Uther *Types of International Folktales* (Uther 2004). Uther's index lists tales of magic, where restoration and rise fairy tales are to be found, as a subset of folktales as a whole. A similar understanding can be found in influential works such as Bauman and Briggs's "Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power," where "folktale" is described as including what we conventionally call "fairy tale" (1992:54). This understanding of fairy tales as a subset of folktales presumptively distributes onto fairy tales the defining characteristics set out for folktales, including the social parameters of their dissemination (told by peasants, the lower classes, or illiterate people), their content (human characters), their setting (unidentifiable in social, historical, or geographical terms), and their truth value (fiction). Despite the common use of a single term "folktale" for the overarching category that includes all of the brief narrative genres that André Jolles (1965) describes as "simple forms," each of the tale types and each of the tales that belong to those tale types has differing parameters and an individual history. Let us begin by using characters, plots, and tale characteristics to sort out fairy tales from other kinds of closely related tales.

The endings of tales give meaning to the narratives that they cap. Do the hero and heroine die miserably on one another's bosom? Does the hero go off on adventures, forswear his beloved, and become a hermit? Or do the hero and heroine marry and live happily ever after, as Stith Thompson and most of posterity defined a "fairy-tale ending"?[15] A rise or a restoration fairy tale's happy ending is integral to the genre. Absent a happy ending of this sort, a tale that involves fairy magic is probably an intentionally parodic inversion, a modern revision, or a postmodern recycling—or it is a fairyland fiction, a genre that differs from rise fairy tales in its cast of characters, its twin worlds (human and fairy), and the nature and behavior of its fairy protagonists (Bottigheimer 2009b).

Fairyland Fictions

Fairyland fictions are stories in which humans and fairies move between two parallel universes, fairyland and the human world. Fairyland narratives were well established in the Middle Ages (Clausen-Stolzenburg 1995; Harf-Lancner 1984) and flourished in the early modern period (Bottigheimer 2009a). Fairies pass back and forth safely between the two worlds, but humans' visits to fairyland often end disastrously, as is

the case in Mme d'Aulnoy's *L'Ile de félicité* (Island of happiness), whose hero dies when he returns to the human world and is overtaken by the earthly passage of time ([1690] 2004:144).

Inadequately distinguishing between fairy tales and fairyland fictions confuses the dating of rise fairy tales' historical beginnings. For instance, Ben-Amos proposes that a parodistic introduction to a late-1500s tall tale in the work of Philippe d'Alcripe indicates that, by then, "fairy tales" had long existed (436). But the tale that Ben-Amos cites does not parody fairy tales; instead, it parodies human encounters with fairies, as they take place in fairyland fictions. Mishaps that occur at mixed gatherings of humans and fairies were a widespread trope in the sixteenth century and are well known to anglophone folklorists from Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* (c. 1595). (For an introduction to fairyland literature, see Scot [1584] 1972; Kirk [1691] 1976; Briggs 1976, 1978.) As Ben-Amos rightly notes, Philippe's fairies-and-fairyland parody presumes a broad and longstanding knowledge of encounters between humans and fairies. It also is clear evidence of a longstanding knowledge of wish-granting fairies, a staple of courtly and chivalric romances from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries that was still well represented in popular romances hawked on sixteenth-century streets in France and Italy. (For a foundational and comprehensive study of fairies in the Middle Ages, including wish-granting fairies, see Harf-Lancner 1984.) Philippe's parodic opening is thus consistent with narrative material about fairies and fairyland that was copiously available from the mid-1400s onward; however, it is not consistent with fairy tales of the sort that we first see in 1550s Venice. Nor does Philippe's tale itself (categorized as ATU 750A, "The Three Wishes") contain any hint of a rise fairy tale. Instead, it tells of self-defeating wishes that return the impoverished wishers to their original low social and economic status.

Fairy Tales and Folk Tales

Ben-Amos's first section header, "Giovanni Francesco Straparola and the Fairy (Folk) Tale," highlights a persistent terminological problem: his assumption that an unlettered *folk* created and transmitted *fairy* tales makes fairy tales *ipso facto* into folk tales. In addition, designating fairy tales as a subset of folktales—as the Aarne-Thompson-Uther index does—effectively confers on fairy tales all of the characteristics that mark folk tales as a whole, such as their millennia-long history and their acknowledged association with various folks. Assuming that *fairy* tales are *folk* tales engenders a descriptive vocabulary in which Straparola, Basile, Perrault, and Mme d'Aulnoy typically are said to "write down" the tales that flow from their pens and in which the phrase "write down" implies that the tales in question first issued from folk mouths. Thus, peasants and country-born nursemaids, even in the absence of textual or material evidence, are unquestioningly inserted into the process of a so-called transcription. In oralist-privileging views, the folk are, and must be, fairy tales' ultimate source, since fairy tales are categorized as folk tales.[16]

As scholars recover *verifiable* information about the dissemination of tales in general, and the dissemination of fairy tales in particular, a different image is emerging. Instead of illiterates, aliterates, and preliterates *telling* tales to other illiterates, aliter-

ates, and preliterates, there are illiterates, aliterates, preliterates, and literates eagerly *listening* to *readings* from print sources. Documenting such situations, Rudolf Schenda describes listening to a tale that is read aloud as a "semiliterate" process. He also documents illiterates, aliterates, preliterates, and literates *retelling* tales that they have *heard read aloud* to a secondary listening group; he describes this as a "semi-oral" process. Only in the nineteenth century does documentation begin for a reverse flow of tales from folk tellers, some of whom are illiterate or aliterate, to educated listeners (Schenda 2007:127; see also Bottigheimer 2009a). Despite repeated modern references to seventeenth-century nursemaids and peasant informants, those illiterate, aliterate, and preliterate fairy-tale tellers remain a troubling surmise. The belief that such informants are the authors' sources for the tales is based on questionable modern interpretations of seventeenth-century literary attributions of a tale to a grandmother, a governess, or a nursemaid.

"Rise Fairy Tale" as a Term and as a Concept

Vaz da Silva and Ziolkowski both propose Apuleius's "Cupid and Psyche" as a rise fairy tale that predates Straparola. In so doing, they overlook the outlines of Straparola's rise fairy tales as proposed in *Fairy Godfather*: one of the protagonists must begin life in poverty. Vaz da Silva substitutes his own definitions of "rise" (dread at marriage to a monster giving way to delight, rise from the human world to Olympus, and rise from earthly princess to divine bride), which allows him to change the definition of a rise in status in order to make Psyche's story into a rise fairy tale. Ziolkowski contends that Psyche's two beautiful but bad sisters, together with an "indefatigably spiteful older woman who stands in Psyche's way," position "Cupid and Psyche" as a "Cinderella" tale and hence make "Cupid and Psyche" into a rise fairy tale (389). This again ignores the actual parameters of the rise fairy tale. (I discuss the problems with categorically treating "Cinderella" as a rise fairy tale below.) Ben-Amos, in an earlier work, makes the point that "Cupid and Psyche" "belonged to a completely different genre . . . the comic romance" (1976b:217). This is a position with which I agree, and it removes Apuleius's "Cupid and Psyche" from the lists of fairy tales, rise or otherwise.

"Contes de Peau d'Asne" as a Term and as a Concept

Vaz da Silva combs through my essay "Perrault au travail" (Bottigheimer 2007), which treats Perrault's assembling "Peau d'Asne" ("Donkeyskin") from components taken from Straparola's "Tebaldo" and Basile's "L'orsa." In the process, however, Vaz da Silva repeatedly and mistakenly understands the words "peau d'asne" solely as the title of Perrault's tale (which describes a princess who escapes her father's incestuous love by wearing the skin of her father's gold-producing donkey), rather than as the general literary term that it was in seventeenth-century France. To Perrault and his contemporaries, as well as to his predecessors, the words "contes de peau d'asne" referred to nonsense tales as a whole.[17] These tales were distinct from *nouvelles* with their Boccaccian compositional rules and their readers' expectations

of verisimilitude; their content also differed from the coarse, body-centered humor of *fabliaux*. In "Fairy-Tale Origins, Fairy-Tale Dissemination, and Folk Narrative Theory" (2006:215), I pointed out that in composing a donkeyskin tale titled "Donkeyskin" ("Peau d'Asne"), Perrault was making a sly literary joke. That is, Perrault took up a genre and created a tale to suit the name of the genre. Vaz da Silva claims, however, that in writing a donkeyskin tale, Perrault "implies" that the particular tale that he wrote already existed: "To assume that Perrault was slyly alluding to 'fanciful or nonsense tales' as contes de peau d'âne implies acknowledging that the 'Donkeyskin' tale was popular enough in his time that it could stand for the whole spectrum of 'fanciful' tales" (416). Vaz da Silva here adopts Paul Delarue's position that Perrault's particular "Donkeyskin" tale already existed among the folk. In fact, numerous tales involving a donkeyskin existed prior to Perrault, but none has the Perrauldian plot (Bottigheimer 2008:179–81). Vaz da Silva's logic falters in the face of seventeenth-century French genre terms and the contents and wording of earlier French donkeyskin tales.

Vaz da Silva seeks further support for the idea that Perrault's *tale* titled "Peau d'Asne" existed among the folk before the 1690s by turning to the words of a commentator whom Marc Soriano described as an anonymous seventeenth-century literary critic. This commentator wrote about "Peau d'Asne" being told among the folk.[18] Two problems mar Vaz da Silva's argument here. First, the "critique anonyme" whom Soriano introduced into the discussion was not an "anonymous Paris critic" but rather anonymous critical remarks in an unsigned introduction that faulted Perrault for not expending more of his wit on a tale that had passed through the hands of uneducated folk (cited in Soriano 1977:113–4). The remarks were probably written by Adriaen Moetjens, the Dutch publisher who pirated French fairy tales and published them in a multivolume series in Amsterdam. (It is in Moetjens's books that the unsigned introduction can be found.) Second, what the author of the critical remarks knew about the extent to which French nannies had held Straparola's "Tebaldo" in their hands is open to question. What *is* significant is that the unsigned remarks located the tales in the nursemaids *hands* rather than in their mouths: it is precisely in their *hands* that Straparola's tale of the wicked king Tebaldo and his incest-averse daughter Doralice would have been when the literate nursemaids paged through a French translation to find and read one of the precursor stories for Perrault's "Peau d'Asne." There had been sixteen French printings of Straparola's book in France before Perrault composed his tale—that is, a minimum of 16,000 copies (see Bottigheimer 2005b). Schenda has argued that at least ten people read each copy of such books, which would have resulted in an estimated 160,000 readings over a 120-year period. Some of those readings (or listenings, in those days of reading aloud) were surely performed by "stupid nursemaids and little children," as the introductory remarks in Moetjens's edition characterized such readers.

A further argument militates against the assumption that Perrault's "Donkeyskin" tale had an earlier existence in French oral tradition. There are only two elements in Perrault's tale that cannot be documented in either Basile's "L'orsa" or Straparola's "Tebaldo/Doralice." Both of these elements are courtly references, which would

have been alien to the oral folk tradition that Vaz da Silva proposes (see Bottigheimer 2007, 2008).

"Fairy Tale" as a Term

I have not yet fully explored the terminological problems of "fairy tale." What exactly is a fairy tale? For many, the tales listed as "Tales of Magic" between 300 and 749 in the Aarne-Thompson-Uther index correlate with and comprise "fairy tales." In the anglophone world, in contrast, all of the animal tales, religious tales, tales of origins, folk tales, and other minor genres in *Grimms' Fairy Tales* are sometimes considered to be "fairy tales," because the most widely used English-language title of that classic work decrees it. The latter understanding has led many people to view the term "fairy tale" as all-inclusive, embracing every category of tale listed in the ATU classification system. By contrast, in Proppian structural terms "fairy tales" are carefully defined as brief magic tales with seven "actants" and thirty-one "moves." Brémondian revisionists have their own definition, which recasts and simplifies Propp's terms (Brémond 1973:11–47). Finally, the literary scholar Elizabeth W. Harries has proposed replacing the concepts of "folk fairy tales" and "literary fairy tales" with alternative subcategories such as "compact" and "complex" fairy tales (2001:17).

The profile of the term "fairy tale" varies considerably among the four contributors to this special issue. Because it is common for "fairy tale" to connote referential, functional, structural, historical, and theoretical aspects without precisely denoting any of these aspects, I have pinpointed and defined the two fairy-tale plots on which I focused attention in *Fairy Godfather*. There, I called them "rise tales" and "restoration tales," leaving out "fairy" in order to avoid the problems associated with the term "fairy tale" and its many differing, partially overlapping definitions. Nonetheless, the general lines of discussion in *Fairy Godfather* made it clear that it was to a subset of fairy tales that I applied the terms "rise" and "restoration."

It should be evident by now that I do not and have not defined "fairy tales" as consisting only of "rise fairy tales" and "restoration fairy tales," as Vaz da Silva persistently claims and as Ziolkowski on occasion casts the terms of my argument. For example, referring to *Fairy Godfather*, Ziolkowski states that "[o]ne split Bottigheimer aims to achieve is between fairy tale (renamed and redefined by her as rise tale) and folktale" (393). If I had redefined the genre of "fairy tales" as consisting only of Straparola's rise and restoration fairy tales, then Ziolkowski would be justified in seeing a "perverse agenda" in *Fairy Godfather*. But since I do not espouse such a view, this criticism can be set aside.

Different kinds of tales have existed for different lengths of time. Folk tales have a history that stretches more than two thousand years into the past. Christian religious tales have a briefer history. *Marienkränze* (Marian miracle tales or legends) flourished in the High Middle Ages, are not documented before that period, and for all intents and purposes disappeared thereafter. Genres come, and—as with *Marienkränze*—genres sometimes go. The absence of evidence for the existence of rise fairy tales before Straparola suggests that these tales came, newly arrived, in the mid-1500s, and—unlike *Marienkränze*—have thrived and spread widely in the modern world.

Errors, Allegations, and One Very False Issue

Legitimate concerns animate the three articles by Ben-Amos, Vaz da Silva, and Zi-olkowski. The issue discussed in the previous paragraphs, however, is based on an outright mischaracterization. In his original critique, presented at the 2006 Milwau-kee meeting of the American Folklore Society, Vaz da Silva edited my sentence, "Straparola's rise tales marked the beginning of all modern fairy tales that reassured their readers that even the most miserably poor boy or girl could gain enormous material wealth" (2002a:6) by removing the last half, creating the preposterous state-ment that "Straparola's rise tales marked the beginning of all modern fairy tales." Based on this, he charged that I claim Straparola invented all modern fairy tales. If Vaz da Silva's misrepresentation had ended with the oral presentation of papers in Milwaukee, there would be no need to discuss it here. But this misrepresentation spread to others. Ziolkowski, for instance, echoes Vaz da Silva's false characterization in wondering at "the assumption that a little more than a dozen wonder tales in-cluded in Straparola's *Le piacevoli notti* could have given rise to all other wonder tales in existence today throughout the world" (382) and in claiming that I posit "that all of what deserves the name of fairy tale clings to just two patterns" (388). The mis-representation was also replicated in a report of the meeting, which includes an at-tendee's query about "pinning an entire phylum of fairy tales to a single source" (Zolkover 2007:26). A misrepresentation succeeds in the moment that it takes on a life of its own. And succeed it did during and after the Milwaukee AFS meeting in 2006. Having had the error pointed out, both authors now incorporate the full sen-tence into their articles, but Vaz da Silva nonetheless repeatedly returns to his mis-characterization, stating, for example, that "in Bottigheimer's analysis, the thirteen or so magic tales that Straparola included in *Le piacevoli notti* supposedly grew into the whole of the European fairy-tale tradition within about 250 years" (399). His falsely formulated position provides Vaz da Silva with a self-created target for criti-cism.

Another important issue that is based on a misrepresentation of my arguments has to do with the compound structure of Straparola's "Fortunio" (night 3, story 4). Vaz da Silva notes that I discuss "Fortunio" as "both a rise and restoration tale" (409). Indeed, the first part of "Fortunio" is a rise tale in which the adopted child of a poor man marries a princess. The second part begins when Fortunio, now royal, sets out adventuring and falls under a curse laid on him by his adoptive mother. With the help of his wife and the aid of magic, he is rescued for a second happy ending. In "Fortunio" a rise fairy tale is followed by a restoration fairy tale (although since the hero is already happily married, there need not be a wedding at the end of the second, restoration, part of the compound plot). A composite storyline like that of "Fortunio" was a hallmark of early modern print fictions, such as Andrea da Barberino's *I Reali di Francia*, which first circulated in manuscript in the early 1400s and then achieved a wide print circulation throughout Europe in the 1500s. Compound storylines were also a feature of English chapbook fictions such as *Tom Thumb* (first published in 1621), and they were fundamental to the birth of the modern novel, which in its earliest formulations described the sequential adventures of a single hero. Thus, "For-

tunio" is not *both* a rise and a restoration tale, as Vaz da Silva would have it, nor is my discussion of it an example of "circular reasoning" (409). I have given an accurate account of a sequentially augmented plot. Furthermore, although Vaz da Silva denies that the rise fairy-tale part of "Fortunio" was original to Straparola, the ATU index presents a different picture in stating that this kind of tale was "[f]irst documented in the sixteenth century by Straparola" (Uther 2004, vol. 1:204).

Regarding what Vaz da Silva describes as my "deafening" silence about Strapa-rola's "Cesarino" (419), there are several reasons why I did not discuss that tale in my 2002 book. Although it slots a poor boy into the dragon-killing role that—from the ancient Greek story of Theseus to sixteenth-century Italian romances—was traditionally occupied by princes, Straparola's tale prominently treats the acquisition of earthly riches as the cause of familial envy and hatred, and thus I felt that the tale's narrative weighting was different from that of a rise fairy tale. A legitimate argument could be made for treating "Cesarino" as another of Straparola's rise fairy tales, but I did not do so. Vaz da Silva rightly states that this tale did not find favor among French fairy-tale authors. It is a narratively awkward tale, and it is not surprising that French fairy-tale authors made use of other templates when they composed tales about dragon slayers.

The history of "Cinderella" represents a folk-narrative issue of another sort, for the tale has (at least) two proposed histories, each with its own reasoning and each contradicting the other's conclusions. One grows from print evidence; the other is based on the assumption of an oral tradition. Viewing "Cinderella" as a primarily oral phenomenon, Vaz da Silva concludes that "in literary tales Cinderella often starts out as the daughter of wealthy people. Orally collected tales, however, tend to present her as the daughter of poor people, or else they do not specify the family's social standing" (422 n. 9). The well-documented history of "Cinderella," however, does not bear out Vaz da Silva's view of a literary/oral divide in this tale. Instead, it suggests change over time. In chronological order, the "Cinderella" heroine was initially a prince's daughter (early-seventeenth-century Basile), then a "gentleman's" daughter (late-seventeenth-century Perrault), and finally "a rich man's daughter" (early-nineteenth-century Grimm). This downward social trajectory continued in succeeding decades, with newly recorded oral and newly created written Cinderella figures in the late nineteenth and early- to mid-twentieth century becoming girls born into a deep poverty from which marriage to a prince (or doctor or entrepreneur) rescued them. Thus, the documented history of "Cinderella" does not chart a literary/oral dichotomy but rather a steady historical decline in the social class of her birth from the 1600s to the 1900s. Vaz da Silva's statement about the social class of "Cinderella" heroines would approach accuracy if it were amended by incorporating historical information (here italicized) and deleting incorrect assumptions (here crossed out): "~~in literary tales~~ *in Basile's early-seventeenth-century tale* Cinderella ~~often~~ starts out as the daughter of ~~wealthy people~~ *a prince, and in Perrault's late-seventeenth-century version is the daughter of a 'gentleman.' Two hundred years later* orally collected *and newly composed* tales *in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries*~~, however,~~ tend to present her as the daughter of poor people."

Even more problematic in Vaz da Silva's article is a persistent avoidance of scholar-

ship that conflicts with his positions. He does not engage with Schenda's foundational research on the interfaces between illiterate communities and written words, the central chapter of which demolishes the view that illiterate communities lived and listened in isolation from literate communities. (My English translation of this chapter is available as Schenda 2007.) Instead, Vaz da Silva's descriptions of oral storytelling assume the existence of a folk who are well insulated from print culture. He also closes his eyes to the centuries-long published history of descendents of Straparola's "Pietro Pazzo" (night 3, story 1) that is described in "Luckless, Witless, and Filthy-Footed: A Socio-Cultural Study and Publishing History Analysis of 'The Lazy Boy' (AT 675)" (Bottigheimer 1993b) and to the way in which that history illuminates relationships between print and the spread of Straparola's tale across Europe and into South America, North America, North Africa, and East Asia.

The publishing history of "The Lazy Boy" tale type has provocative companions in studies of other traditional popular tales. One is Luisa Rubini's stimulating "Fortunatus in Italy: A History between Translations, Chapbooks, and Fairy Tales" (2003), which reveals the primacy of print in determining which tale versions survive and spread. Rubini's evidence is paralleled, and the importance of publishing history studies for folk narrative is confirmed, in Nathalie Guézennec's "La mémoire de conteurs bretons" (Some Breton storytellers' memory) (2009). At a 2006 conference at Queens University Belfast titled "The Conte: Oral and Written Interfaces," research offering formidable evidence for the primacy of the written word at the oral-written interface was presented in talks by Brían Ó Catháin, Nathalie Guézennec, John Conteh-Morgan, Janice Carruthers, and Caroline Sumpter.[19] In contrast to this twenty-first-century scholarship, Vaz da Silva's fairy-tale discourse is dominated by Jacob Grimm's nineteenth-century convictions that darkness shrouds the spread of stories (*Erzählungen*) and that printed tales were written down *from* the folk rather than *for* the folk (Grimm [1831] 1884).[20]

Vaz da Silva also wonders why upper-class readers in Renaissance Venice would enjoy a rise fairy tale. Consider, however, that the sixteenth-century scions of patrician Venetian families, schooled in the classics, drew much of their understanding of narrative tropes from Aristotle's *Poetics*, a canonical treatise that excluded persons of impoverished origins from performing heroic deeds or performing impossible tasks. These parameters for high literature remained influential until the later 1700s. For Renaissance Venetian patrician readers, then, a heroic country bumpkin or a poor but noble-minded city girl would be the stuff of comedic parody and a cause for laughter. Readers who were artisans and servants, on the other hand, were unburdened by Aristotelian poetics, which was not taught in the town and city schools where boys and girls from artisanal families were educated. These readers could take pleasure in rise fairy tales as compensatory narratives in a tough and economically unyielding world. Thus, the conventions that would initially appear to limit the popularity of rise fairy tales actually render them enjoyable, for different reasons, to two different readerships.

Vaz da Silva also occasionally misuses—or misunderstands—a reference work's data. In another effort to show that rise fairy tales existed before Straparola, he argues that

ATU 314 ("Goldener") existed in both restoration and rise forms before 1551. However, the tales that he cites as examples of "Goldener" contradict that claim: the twelfth-century *Robert le Diable* (Robert the Devil), for example, ends as do many medieval romances, not with a wedding and a happily-ever-after but with a non- or anti-wedding, and with the protagonist forsaking marriage for the kingdom of heaven. In order to recast *Fairy Godfather*'s definition of rise fairy tales and to substitute a definition of his own making, Vaz da Silva describes the ending of *Robert le Diable* as an "ultimate rise" (413) that trumps a mere wedding to royalty. Then he cites *nineteenth- and twentieth-century* "Goldener"-type tales, some of which have the poor protagonists typical of rise fairy tales, to prove the existence of *pre-1550s* "Goldener" rise fairy tales. But all of the actual pre-1550s "Goldener"-type tales that he cites from the Aarne-Thompson-Uther tale-type listings have the noble protagonists that are typical of *restoration* fairy tales. Thus, pre-1551 texts of the "Goldener" tale-type do not demonstrate the pre-1551 existence of a rise fairy tale, as Vaz da Silva would have it, but provide instead another piece of evidence of the medieval preference for restoration fairy tales. Further, Vaz da Silva's citations of nineteenth- and twentieth-century "Goldener" rise fairy tales (with their poor protagonists) confirm the nineteenth- and twentieth-century shift away from restoration fairy tales and toward rise fairy tales.

Vaz da Silva's use of the ATU index highlights another issue that is central to folk-narrative research. Even though folk-narrative researchers benefit from the ATU index's highly useful documentation of relationships among tales, and even though ATU listings guide scholars into and through a maze of narratives, it is still up to us as scholars to examine the reports of oral tellings and the printed texts on which the listings themselves are based. The ATU listings in Vaz da Silva's note 4, which he says document the pre-1551 existence of rise fairy-tale plots, do not in fact present a single pre-Straparolean rise fairy tale. ATU 432 ("The Prince as Bird") has a princely protagonist, and ATU 433B ("King Lindorm") an animal protagonist; therefore these two stories do not fit the rise fairy-tale plot. The reference to the fourteenth-century writer Giovanni Sercambi in ATU 513A ("Six Go through the Whole World") has a problem of another sort: the relevant tale in Sercambi's *Novelle* ([1374] 1972) is not in fact a "Six Go Through the Whole World" tale (that is, a tale in which a poor person gains a royal wife through the marvelous intervention of six unusually gifted companions). It is, in fact, an altogether different tale of rascally priests trying to seduce an honest wife.[21] Reading other examples of ATU 513A, in historical order, further shows that poor boys do not get princesses in these tales until their nineteenth-century tellings. For example, Basile's seventeenth-century version, "Ignoramus," in his *Lo cunto de li cunti* (The tale of tales) (day 3, story 8), does not have a poor boy marrying a princess. Instead, we see a king declining to give his daughter to a stupid suitor, whom the king buys off. The antihero's failure to marry the princess whom he sought obviously disqualifies Basile's tale from being a rise fairy tale, as does the fact that the antihero is not poor but the "son of a rich father" ([1634–1636] 2007:267). Vaz da Silva's remaining citations are equally mistaken. ATU 533 ("The Speaking Horsehead") has a royal protagonist; the pre-1551 (Sercambi) reference for ATU 653 ("The Four Skillful Brothers") has no royal wedding for the poor peasant at the end but rather a dystopic conclusion;[22] and ATU 707 ("The Three Gold-

en Children") is once again an example of a restoration fairy tale with royal protagonists. Of the further ATU tale types that Vaz da Silva lists in the course of his article, some include motifs that appear in modern rise fairy tales, but not a single one is a pre-1551 rise fairy tale.

In a different vein, Vaz da Silva objects to *Fairy Godfather* because of differences in the total numbers of fairy tales from *Le piacevoli notti* that are identified there. One number in *Fairy Godfather* refers to Jack Zipes's count (2001) based on the total number of tales of rascality and magic; the second is the total number of rise and restoration tales; the third is Vaz da Silva's own count of all tales that include magic (but not marriage) in addition to rise and restoration tales that end with a wedding. In the process of counting up fairy tales, however, Vaz da Silva again disregards *Fairy Godfather*'s distinctions between rise and restoration fairy tales. His objection is thus trivial and does not merit serious discussion.

Pre-1551 Rise Fairy Tales?

Ziolkowski and Ben-Amos both advance pre-1551 narratives as evidence of the existence of rise fairy tales before Straparola. Ziolkowski offers the Latin *Asinarius*, a school narrative that tells of a long-barren queen who finally gives birth—to a baby donkey. The little prince, brought up with solicitude, passes a happy youth mastering courtly skills. Once he recognizes his donkey-ness, he leaves home and joins the court of a distant and distinguished king. As a "prince of the blood," he takes his rightful place at the king's table, freely declares his favor for the resident royal princess, and charms her with his fine and considerate manners. Eventually the king offers the princess to him in marriage. The willing princess is even more delighted when, on the marriage bed, the prince lays aside his donkey skin. A watchful servant reveals all to the king, who enters their chamber, snatches the donkey skin, and destroys it. The king then divides his kingdom with his newly peltless son-in-law, who ultimately inherits the kingdom in its entirety (Ziolkowski 2007:341–50).

Asinarius describes a royal hero who marries a princess, and this cast of characters would seem to place it among restoration fairy tales. Other characteristics of the story, however, argue against its inclusion in this category. For instance, the donkey hero begins life as a gently educated prince, experiences respectful treatment from his parents and their courtiers, suffers neither danger nor tests, and undergoes no trials, aside from a brief discomfiture about his donkey-ness. Instead, he passes directly from his home court to a hearty welcome at a foreign court, where he marries a princess, sheds his donkey skin, and lives happily ever after. The story thus lacks the exposure to danger and the necessity to perform superhuman feats of bravery, endurance, or perseverance that are characteristic of Straparola's restoration fairy tales. When Straparola made use of the same motifs that appear in *Asinarius*—a beastly suitor, a pretty girl, a transformation, and a wedding—he composed a new kind of tale, not a donkey-prince's pleasant sojourn at a foreign court culminating in an obstacle-free royal marriage, but a rise fairy tale that linked the poor girl Meldina to a pig-prince and made of her a queen free from want (night 2, story 1). Ziolkowski's other examples of medieval fairy tales similarly demonstrate

the absence of the rise fairy-tale genre before the 1550s: Egbert of Liège's eleventh-century red-clad girl is a miracle tale, the eleventh-century *One-Ox* is a fabliau, "Cupid and Psyche" is a novella-length tale, and *The Dialogue of Solomon and Marcolf* is a joke.

Ben-Amos proposes ancient as well as medieval tales as candidates for pre-Straparolean rise fairy tales. The first of these is Claudius Aelianus's account of the life of Aspasia in his *Varia Historia* (translated in Johnson 1997:162–6). When divine intervention heals an unsightly growth on Aspasia's face, the poor girl adds beauty to her virtue and modesty, which, in the aftermath of a Persian military victory, gets her carried off to King Cyrus for bedtime pleasures. Unlike the other captured girls who readily accept their fate, Aspasia shrinks from Cyrus's hand. Ben-Amos tells Aspasia's story up to the point at which she refuses Cyrus's present of a necklace, which she tells him to give to his mother. But Claudius Aelianus's story goes further. When Cyrus is killed in battle, Aspasia comes into the possession of the victor, King Artaxerxes. While still mourning Cyrus's death, she must adorn herself for Artaxerxes, who is inflamed with passion for her. At this point Claudius Aelianus interjects surprising information: Artaxerxes also nourishes a continuing passion for the fairest and most beautiful eunuch in Asia, Teridates, whose recent death was causing him boundless grief. Aspasia earns her biographer's abundant praise because she comforted Artaxerxes by acceding to his request that she "come to him dressed in . . . [the dead eunuch's] clothes until the intensity of his lamentations passed. She obeyed him and did him this favor" (166). This is the tale of a remarkable young woman: beautiful, modest, an object of desire for Cyrus, and a source of wise counsel. For Artaxerxes, she was an object of desire in herself, as well as a source of cross-dressing comfort to relieve his homoerotic grief. As Claudius Aelianus's story progresses she is eventually united with a third king.

If a story is defined solely as the sum of its motifs, then it is possible to cast Claudius Aelianus's story of Aspasia as something that has some, but not all, of the requirements for a rise fairy tale: after all, it begins with poverty and includes a marvelous event (a cure for her facial growth). However, no weddings ensue, and instead it is sex, both heterosexual and imitatively homosexual, that links her to three kings, one after the other. The story makes the point that Aspasia has rare qualities for a woman: she shuns preferment and riches and performs sexually both as a woman and as a man. Placed within its narrative context, Claudius Aelianus's tale presents:

1. A heroine as a historical figure (which technically would make the tale a legend).[23]
2. A heroine's poverty not as a source of suffering but as a fact that enhances her attractiveness.[24]
3. A prominent emphasis on raw sexuality (a highly developed component that does not figure in Ben-Amos's argument).[25]
4. No indication of a wedding, and most particularly, no suggestion that a wedding to a king has resolved a situation of misery brought on by poverty.[26]

Serious obstacles thus stand in the way of calling Claudius Aelianus's story of Aspasia a rise fairy tale of the "Cinderella" sort or, for that matter, a fairy tale of any sort. Scholarship requires more than a marvelous removal of a growth followed by sex with a king to assume that the story of Aspasia and "Cinderella" exemplify the same tale type.

Ben-Amos also offers a late-thirteenth-century tale about Joshua's daughter as a candidate for a medieval rise fairy tale. The hero of this tale is an illegitimate son (assumed to be poor), who through an unusual sequence of events comes to marry the daughter of the priest Joshua. Originally, King Solomon is opposed to this marriage, but by the end of the tale he is forced to accept it. This tale does not actually show a hero's elevation to royal estate, as Ben-Amos claims; after all, the bride's father (Joshua) was a prophet rather than a king. Instead, it makes the point that no matter how great Solomon might be among the creatures of the air, the cattle of the fields, or the military commanders of the land, he nonetheless has to accept God's decree (as transmitted to him by an eagle) and recognize the limits of his power vis-à-vis the Almighty. It is notable that the thirteenth-century manuscript frames the tale in these terms and does not incorporate any mention of a wedding or an accession to wealth, which are the hallmarks of Straparola's 1550s rise fairy-tale plot. Only by misperceiving the evidence and by ignoring the homiletic thrust of the story in its context is it "possible to interpret such a narrative as social projection, expressing the aspirations of a depressed and oppressed social class," as Ben-Amos suggests (438).

A more plausible and provocative candidate for a pre-1551 rise fairy tale can be found in "Solomon's Daughter." This tale, which exists in many variants (Elstein 2004; Bin-Gorion 1976:170–1, 1990:70–2), begins with King Solomon seeing in the stars that his own daughter will marry the poorest man in Israel. To prevent this unwelcome possibility, Solomon places his daughter in a lofty and doorless tower guarded by seventy eunuchs. Then he declares, "Now let me see the acts and working of His [God's] Name" (Bin-Gorion 1976:170). The tale presents the same central tension as does "Joshua's Daughter" in the challenge posed by an earthly king (Solomon) to the ruler of the universe. Who will prove to be the stronger?

If their religious frames are omitted, "Joshua's Daughter" and "Solomon's Daughter" can be interpreted as versions of ATU 310 ("The Maiden in the Tower") or ATU 930 ("The Prophecy"). The ATU index describes the latter tale type as "various tales dealing with a poor boy for whom future greatness or a marriage to a rich girl is foretold" (Uther 2004:568). This description is not a precise fit for "Joshua's Daughter" and "Solomon's Daughter," however, because these tales are focused on Solomon's presumptions rather than on the groom's fate. Neither does this *midrashic* tale, with its religious focus and its discussion of divinely ordained marriage, fit comfortably within the secular "Maiden in the Tower" tale type.

Before discussing these tales in depth, let us review the parameters of Straparola's rise fairy tales. Straparola's rise tales begin with an impoverished boy or girl who, through magic, marries royalty and becomes wealthy. Rise fairy tales are secular tales that are explicitly about earthly rewards—that is, about a shift from hunger to sufficiency, from grinding poverty to comfort and wealth. Now let us turn to the thirteenth-century French-Jewish version of "Solomon's Daughter," which was cited by Ben-Amos at the 2006 AFS meeting. It begins, "[King] Solomon, may he rest in peace, had a dream. In the dream they told him that the smallest of all the tribes will marry a girl, a maiden, of the largest of the tribes" (Beit-Arié 1985:631). Thus, in this medieval tale, the difference in social level between the boy and the girl is initially presented as political (the smallest versus the largest of the tribes). Eventually an economic

difference also emerges, as the boy is identified as the son of a blind beggar, a condition that confirms his undesirably poor status.

The story then turns to the boy and a remarkable series of events in his life, which end in his taking refuge inside the skin of a dead horse. A not-very-large bird, a hoopoe, carries the horseskin-enveloped boy to the roof of the tower in which Solomon has confined his daughter.[27] There, the boy cuts himself free, and the princess, who "desired him" every bit as much as did the princess her donkey lover in *Asinarius*, helps him to enter her tower room. Quite soon "she conceived [a child] from him," whereupon they marry in the sight of God. Reconciled to the marriage, King Solomon promises the couple "a large sum of money," acknowledges that "God made this marriage," and gives a great wedding feast.[28] Up to this point, the tale meets nearly all of the criteria for a rise fairy tale in that it mentions a poor boy who, by means of magic, marries royalty and accedes to wealth (although without suffering tasks or trials). The tale's focus, however, remains on Solomon, as it continues with an affirmation of the king's religious and political legitimacy. Solomon performs marvels that lead to everyone's accepting him as "the king from Heaven who was worthy to rule over them. . . . all the kings agreed and accepted him as their king, and also Hiram king of Tsor kissed the hands and feet of Solomon may he rest in peace" (Haberman 1975:196, trans. Dan Ben-Amos).

The tale's ending reveals the midrashic frame story, affirming Solomon's preeminence in musicianship, control over the birds of heaven, and dominance among earthly kings. Embedded within that overarching narrative is a deeper politico-religious message that God's purposes subordinate those of Solomon. The poor-boy-marrying-a-princess part is not a freestanding narrative but rather exemplary evidence of the limits on royal power, even when the king in question is the mighty Solomon. "Solomon's Daughter" thus communicates in politico-religious terms the same lesson that Canute, the Danish medieval king of England, taught in secular terms when he showed his flattering courtiers that his ruling power stopped short of controlling the tides (this tale is related by a contemporary chronicler, Henry of Huntingdon) (1991:199). The message about a ruler's limited powers vis-à-vis God's unlimited omnipotence is the common denominator of all versions of "Solomon's Daughter" and "Joshua's Daughter," but this message is not explicitly stated within the tales. Furthermore, as published in the modern world, these tales have been lifted from the homiletic and exegetic context within which they were used by influential medieval Jewish commentators such as Rabbi Tanhuma (1989). In examining the pre-Straparola use of these tales, such context must be taken into consideration.

The possibility that the decontextualized "Solomon's Daughter" story can be seen as a pre-1551 rise fairy tale gains a measure of traction from numerous narrative motifs that resemble those in rise fairy tales: a *poor boy* (because his father is a blind beggar) experiences a *marvel* (a bird carrying him inside a horse skin to a tower roof), *marries* a princess, and even receives a promise of *money* from Solomon. These motifs correspond to the necessary elements and their order in Straparola's rise fairy tales, as specified in *Fairy Godfather*. Removed from its frame, this tale indicates a distinct social rise for its poor hero and exemplifies the cast of characters and plot trajectory of a rise fairy tale. The tale's exemplary role in the normative context of its

religious frame, however, together with the absence of heroic tasks and trials, attenuates its being understood as a rise fairy tale.

"Solomon's Daughter" is an incisive example, and it stimulates further thought about the nature of rise fairy tales. Drawing on my earlier discussion about tales and their constituent elements, I would argue that even though the elements of "Solomon's Daughter" correspond to those of a rise fairy tale, something more than those elements is required. Is it significant that the framing tale (about Solomon's preeminence) makes the framed tale (about Solomon's daughter) into an example of the truth that God's will cannot be circumvented? After all, the framed tale about the son of the smallest tribe and Solomon's daughter is not a freestanding fiction like "Costantino Fortunato." In Straparola's tale, the opening statement makes the story's thrust unmistakable: "It is no rare event, beloved ladies, to see a rich man brought to extreme poverty, or to find one who from absolute penury has mounted to high estate. And this last-named fortune befell a poor wight of whom I have heard tell, who from being little better than a beggar attained the full dignity of a king" (Straparola [1551–1553] 1898, vol. 4:6). The closing statement of "Costantino Fortunato" is even clearer: "And by these means Costantino rose from an estate of poverty or even beggary to be a powerful king, and lived long with Elisetta his wife, leaving children by her to be the heirs of his kingdom" (16–7). Rise fairy tales such as "Costantino Fortunato" are quintessentially secular and communicate a narrative of hope about improving one's earthly circumstances. An ethical exemplum such as "Solomon's Daughter," on the other hand, manifests a very different kind of message. Framed within religious and political reference points, it displays the eternal truth that even a king of Solomon's preeminent rank cannot circumvent God's will.

The worldview distinctions separating "Solomon's Daughter" from "Costantino Fortunato" are mirrored in Ben-Amos's example of "Whittington's Cat." There, Ben-Amos accepts that the same or similar motifs can produce tales belonging to different genres, depending on how they are used—specifically, that the constituent elements of "Whittington's Cat" (a poor boy, a remarkable cat, worldly success, and a wedding) are presented so that they produce a *legend* about a historical personage, while those of "Costantino Fortunato" (a poor boy, a remarkable *fairy*-cat, a wedding, and wealth) are told in a way that results in a rise fairy tale.[29] Is it logical to apply the same reasoning to the story in which the boy from the smallest tribe marries King Solomon's daughter? I think that it is. I will acknowledge that "Solomon's Daughter" is a medieval instance of a motif complex like the ones in Straparola's rise fairy tales, while pointing out that it carried a medieval message of divine limitations on earthly power. Of even greater importance to my argument, however, is the fact that the plot of "Solomon's Daughter" did not spread to secular storytelling. In contrast, when Straparola produced a rags-to-riches-through-magic-and-marriage tale in the 1550s, this plot and its human-centered message of earthly happiness took hold, slowly at first and then with increasing vigor in the 1800s and 1900s.

A Rise Fairy Tale in the Making

To continue the discussion about the significance of motifs, messages, and genre, and to demonstrate the powerful differences between motifs and messages, I will introduce

a pre-1551 tale whose motif cluster of a poor boy, magic, and marriage to a princess produces a tale that resembles Straparola's rise fairy tales far more than does the same motif cluster in "Solomon's Daughter." It is the fifteenth-century "Lionbruno," which begins with an impoverished father delivering his son (Lionbruno) to the devil in return for money and a rich catch of fish (Cirino of Ancona [1470] 1976). Escaping the devil's clutches, the boy is carried off to the castle of Princess Aquilina, where for the next eight years he learns knightly skills. Lionbruno and the princess marry, and then Lionbruno departs on adventures. After breaking a prohibition that his wife had set, Lionbruno loses her, but then many adventures later he regains her and lives happily ever after.

Although "Lionbruno" is a fundamentally secular tale, formulaic religious invocations both open and close the narrative, which takes place in a world that is marked by religion and liturgy. The tale also incorporates a great deal of magic, and it thematizes poverty and money. However, despite its full complement of rise fairy-tale motifs, "Lionbruno" does not qualify as such a tale for a number of reasons. The heroes of rise fairy tales typically require little or no change or improvement to become acceptable in a princess's eyes (Bottigheimer 2009a:97). In strong contrast, Princess Aquilina requires her protégé Lionbruno to undergo intensive practice and lengthy study before he is deemed worthy of her hand. The perspectives revealed in "Lionbruno" thus differ greatly from those that motivate Straparola's rise fairy tales.

Both the 1470 print version and the pre-1460 manuscript version of "Lionbruno" carry textual markers for public oral delivery, with phrases such as "questa storia io dica" (I speak this story) and "contarò" (I will tell) (Cirino of Ancona 2002:1–3). The pre-1460 manuscript insinuates a fictive orality by providing its performer with words that claim he can neither read nor write ("chè liegere nè scrivere non so io") and with a request for God to strengthen his memory of the story (Cirino of Ancona 2002:2). These words and phrases, written down as they were for the storyteller, are disingenuous remarks. Their falseness would have been obvious to the teller who made use of a written manuscript and probably also to the audience members, if they saw the storyteller reading from a manuscript. By incorporating references to oral delivery into a text for performers, the pre-1460 manuscript is a perfect example of a transitional text in the cultural shift from audible to visible symbols (see Vinaver 1971).

Historical Readers, Historical Tellers

Toward the end of his article, Ben-Amos suggests that an "attempt to draw causal relations and correspondences between socioeconomic trends and literature requires the identification of Straparola's readers" (440). I wish that I could provide a list of exactly who bought the thousands of copies of Straparola's books, but owners' identities are preserved only in a very small number of expensively bound surviving copies (Bottigheimer 2005b:23–5). Beyond this, the only precise identities that we can infer are those of a few seventeenth-century readers of Straparola's tales; the works of Mlle Lhéritier, Mme d'Aulnoy, Mme de Murat, and Charles Perrault reveal that these authors all read Straparola's tales closely in 1690s Paris.

Because Straparola addressed his books "To the Ladies," Ben-Amos concludes that

the readership for the rise and restoration fairy tales that Straparola included along with his urban tales must have been "not the artisans but rather the emerging female readership" (440). (Ben-Amos appears in this passage to refer to female readers of a higher socioeconomic level than those in the artisanal classes.) I argue for a broader intended readership for three reasons. First, I have observed that in commercial books, tale content is generally tailored to its intended buyers. If *Le piacevoli notti* had been intended solely, or even principally, for women buyers, then a far larger proportion of its stories would have been designed to appeal to this audience. Second, the 1550s Venetian reading public included nobles, merchants, and literate artisans. In such a publishing environment, a strategy that addressed all of those potential buyers with stories relevant to their varying conditions would have been desirable. I would argue that such a strategy was actually realized in *Le piacevoli notti*. Finally, in economic terms we may reasonably infer that most copies of his books were bought by readers who did not want—or could not afford—to bind them, because the number of surviving bound copies is relatively small (Pirovano 2000, 2001).[30] Bound copies of books were listed as items of value in medieval and early modern wills and household inventories, if only because the simplest forms of binding normally doubled or trebled the price of the book. The paucity of surviving bound copies thus strongly suggests that the overwhelming majority of copies were bought by humble readers. (It is theoretically possible that wealthy buyers treated the book as a disposable commodity, but this seems an unlikely explanation for the absence of thousands of bound copies from the multiple imprints of Straparola's work. Such items were unlikely to have been discarded *en masse*.)

The issue of presuming a female readership goes further, however. One reason that some scholars are quick to assume a female audience for Straparola's tales is the belief that such tales were generally the domain of women. Were women, as Ben-Amos assumes, the actual tellers of Boccaccio's, Straparola's, and Basile's tales? Or were the textual allusions to women-as-storytellers in these works simply a reflection of long-standing literary convention? This category, women-as-storytellers, represents a two-fold problem in literary history. The first aspect of the problem is the venerable literary trope that positions a written narrative as an author's recounting of a previously told tale. Even the words denoting brief narratives are frequently related to verbs that indicate an act of oral telling: the Latin *fabula* from *fabulor*, the Italian *racconto* from *raccontare*, the Spanish *cuento* from *contare* (Basile's term, *cunto*, owes much to the Spanish), the French *conte* from *conter*, and the English *tale* from *tell*. A corresponding literary convention of stories as tales that were *told* produced the much-used literary trope of tales told by and within a socially, morally, or aesthetically ideal group. The best known and most often imitated example of this trope is Boccaccio's *Decameron* ([1353] 1962), whose pattern was followed by most early Italian authors, including Straparola. (Some few authors diverged from this practice: Chaucer, for instance, eschewed ideal narrators for exemplars from real life, and Basile substituted drooling, sniveling, and scabrous anti-ideal narrators for beautifully ideal Boccaccian ones.) The second, related point of concern in regard to the trope of women-as-storytellers is that this device, while ancient in origin, is not consistent in its expression. Apuleius's fictive narrator for "Cupid and Psyche" is a drunken crone, whose appearance is deeply at

odds with the tale she tells, and Basile's narrators are the equivalent of Neapolitan fishwives, whose speech improbably mixes gutter talk with ornate rhetoric. Boccaccio's narrators, on the other hand, include men, as do those of Straparola, Chaucer, and countless nineteenth- and twentieth-century folktale collections. The trope of women-as-storytellers is thus far from universal in its application.

Constituting a group of storytellers is the first task of a tale collection author who uses the convention of a storytelling occasion. The group that Straparola fashioned was as clever a fiction as the storytelling groups invented by his predecessors. He made use of the familiar Sforza name and parts of Sforza family history to create a semblance of contemporary time (the late 1530s) and accessible place (the island of Murano in the Venetian lagoon) and to thereby achieve the verisimilitude required of late medieval and early modern tale collections (Williams 2009). But Straparola then contradicted that verisimilitude—whether accidentally or intentionally, we cannot know—by incorporating several historical figures who were either dead or absent from Venice in the late 1530s and by gathering an impossible mix of women for the frame tale: one noble widow, one merchant wife, and several probable courtesans (Bottigheimer 2002a:92–100). The Sforza daughter described by Straparola is either misnamed or fictional. But for the sake of argument, let us assume that a woman as august as a widowed Sforza daughter could have been present at a storytelling assembly that included a merchant's wife (who might on a rare occasion have found her way into the Sforza daughter's noble presence). We cannot make a similar imaginative stretch for the courtesan-like beautiful young women without family identities whom Straparola places in the frame tale, because in Renaissance Venice such women could never have gained admittance to a Sforza daughter's company. Thus, we are left with fictions told by fictitious tellers, whose gender probably owes more to Boccaccian-based literary tradition than to real life.

Origins of the Trope of Folk Creation and Folk Transmission

The idea that the folk created fairy tales of all sorts, including rise fairy tales, and then passed them on by word of mouth over generations has been current for so long that it has come to seem an unquestionable premise. And yet, this perspective on the creation and transmission of fairy tales has a specific history. Lively and compelling records of the emergence of the idea of folk creation and transmission lie in the forewords, afterwords, and embedded commentary of early fairy-tale collections. Such paratextual material is seldom reproduced and seldom referred to, but it reveals a great deal about the beginnings of the association between fairy tales and folk creation.

Johann Gottfried Herder is generally credited with the concept of *Volkspoesie* (folk poetry) in conjunction with fairy tales' origins, but his was a "hazy" and imprecise vision based on folksongs and Ossianic verse (Oergel 2006:52). The first explicit association of fairy tales with the folk (*Volksmärchen*) grew out of Johann Karl August Musäus's 1782 preface to *Volksmährchen der Deutschen* (Folktales of the Germans) ([1782–1787] 1961), where his authorial persona conducted a learned discourse with a folk figure, "Mr. David Runkel, Thinker and Sexton at Saint Sebald's Church." A more perfect example of inventing folk contributions to literature can hardly be

found. There is no evidence that the folk played any role in Musäus's book of tales; this is corroborated by textual analysis (Bottigheimer 2000b) and confirmed by the heavy irony with which Musäus presents his prefatory discussion. Benedikte Naubert took up Musäus's folk-implicating title and altered and affirmed it in the title of her *Neue Volksmährchen der Deutschen* (New folktales of the Germans) ([1789–1793] 2001), which provided a rubric for citing the folk as a repository of tales. At about the same time, Friedrich Bertuch began republishing scores of fairy tales of French origin in ever more cheaply priced editions of his *Blaue Bibliothek aller Nationen* (Blue library of all nations) ([1790–1800] 1990–1994), which reached far more widely into Germany's reading population than had Naubert's "folk" tales. In summary, Musäus's preface precipitated the concept of *Volksmärchen* as it is now understood, and Bertuch's *Blaue Bibliothek* effectively distributed the broad variety of tales that constituted Germany's expanding late-eighteenth-century and early-nineteenth-century Märchen corpus. Thus, it can be said that a critical mass of concept (Musäus and Naubert) and content (Bertuch's *Blaue Bibliothek*) was achieved between 1782 and 1806, the last year in which the *Blaue Bibliothek* introduced new fairy-tale material for German readers.

The Grimms' linking of fairy tales to the folk, in their prefaces to the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* and elsewhere, consolidated the concept of *Volksmärchen* from 1812 onward (see, for example, Grimm and Grimm 1812–1815). Once established, this new concept was used widely in Germany. One example of its use is the retroactive redefinition of the French term *mie* (governess, close friend) as a word describing an unlettered peasant nursemaid. Wilhelm Grimm's son Herman did his own refiguring of the past when he vividly "remembered" a nurse in his mother's childhood household as being the "old Marie" who told Wilhelm so many tales—no matter that this old Marie had died before Herman was born (Rölleke 1986:290–8). The broadly influential English editor of fairy tales Andrew Lang did much the same thing in his introduction to Perrault's tales, when he portrayed Perrault as stooping down to hear his little boy repeat "his nurse's stories, and record them in the chronicles of Mother Goose" (Lang 1888:xxiv). Such is the legacy of European romanticism's reformulation of the folk as the originators of folk tradition, a concept that remained largely unchallenged until Jonas Frykman and Orvar Lofgren's *Culture Builders* (1979) and Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger's *Invention of Tradition* (1983).[31]

Rise Fairy Tales in European Fairy-Tale Collections in the Sixteenth through the Twentieth Centuries

Of the fairy tales in Straparola's collection, approximately half were rise fairy tales. Basile, however, overwhelmingly favored restoration fairy tales, as did most of the late-seventeenth-century French fairy-tale authors. I have noted that, well into the eighteenth century, restoration fairy tales were proportionately dominant, while the impact of rise fairy tales remained minimal. Even in the mid-eighteenth century, the influential, didactically moralizing fairy-tale author Mme Leprince de Beaumont did not favor impoverished origins, and more often than not she chose her prince-marrying heroines from the merchant classes. (Impoverishment was a feature in only a

few of her tales, such as "Beauty and the Beast," where Beauty's merchant father had lost his former wealth.) The early-nineteenth-century Grimm collection was the first in which the proportion of rise fairy tales began to increase. I have not calculated the proportion of rise fairy tales in each of the Grimms' editions, from the 1810 Ölenberg manuscript to the Final Large Edition of 1857, but I would not be surprised if—among the Grimms' magic tales—the proportion of rise fairy tales steadily grew.

The period from 1800 to 1810 was when public schools began to be instituted in German and Austrian cities, towns, and villages to introduce literacy and religious education to children of humble parentage. With each succeeding year, literacy rates rose in Austria and Germany, and within twenty to thirty years literacy levels among the German-speaking poor approached those that had existed in mid-sixteenth-century Venice (see Schenda 1970:42–66). It is possible—in fact, it is more than likely—that a literate nineteenth-century German mass readership elicited the same kinds of hope-inducing, magic-propelled plots of social and economic rise from its story-proffering publishers as did Straparola's sixteenth-century Venetian book-buying market, with its literate servants and artisans. The principal difference is that nineteenth-century fairy tales were regularly carried from print centers into the countryside by armies of colporteurs, while sixteenth-century ones were principally marketed in towns and cities.

Scholarly Positioning and the Implications of Fairy Godfather's Reasoning and Conclusions

My 2002 book, like my scholarship as a whole, is informed by the classic methodologies of literature and history. This is to say that it privileges the words in which a tale is told along with the motifs of which it is composed and that it relies on documentable sources and texts.[32] I draw on observations of, and conclusions about, stability in popular literature that were worked out by Rudolf Schenda in *Volk ohne Buch* (People without books) (1970) and *Die Lesestoffe der kleinen Leute* (Ordinary people's reading matter) (1976). The readings of ordinary people had real staying power: in a March 28, 2007, e-mail message, Paul Grendler explained that the reading matter of the 1630s tailor in Alessandro Manzoni's *I Promessi Sposi*, set in northern Italy, was "exactly the same as I found in Venice in the late sixteenth century."

Fairy Godfather's biography of Straparola and its conjectural conversation with his publisher are based on studies in the social history of Venice and the larger Veneto region in the late Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Baroque period and on investigations of literacy, schooling, urban versus rural life, printing, publishing, and commercial routes of book distribution. With reference to the textual transmission of fairy tales, I accept the validity of Manfred Grätz's evidence and reasoning in *Das Märchen in the deutschen Aufklärung: Vom Feenmärchen zum Volksmärchen* (The tale in the German enlightenment: From tales about fairies to folktales) (1988), which charts the importation of French fairy tales into Germany during the eighteenth century and their translation, publications, retranslations, and distribution in popular print. Since writing *Fairy Godfather*, I have continued to ponder the development of modern fairy tales. Laurence Harf-Lancner's *Les fées*

au Moyen Age: Morgane et Mélusine: La naissance des fées (Fairies in the Middle Ages: Morgan and Melusine: The birth of the fairies) (1984) explains medieval reformulations of Greek and Roman mythological figures into fairy figures, a mixing that is exemplified in the English *Sir Orfeo* romance (Bliss 1966; Laskaya and Salisbury 1995) and the French *Perceforest* romance (Roussineau 1979–2007). In this context of generic evolution, Straparola is responsible for yet another innovation: his fairies functioned solely within the human world and had no back stories in a parallel fairy realm. This separated his rise and restoration fairy tales in one more way from preexisting (and subsequent) fairyland fictions.[33]

A persistent problem in understanding the history of fairy tales involves the relationship between motifs and fairy tales. It is often assumed that the presence of individual fairy-tale motifs in past centuries or millennia means that the modern tales in which those motifs appear also existed in the distant past. For instance, many early modern and modern fairy-tale motifs can be found in the texts of medieval tales, but the tales in which they appeared were not fairy tales in the modern sense of that term. This noteworthy conclusion crowns Maren Clausen-Stolzenburg's remarkable study, *Märchen und mittelalterliche Literaturtradition: Zur Entstehung der "Kinder- und Hausmärchen"* (Tales and the medieval literary tradition: The development of the *Nursery and Household Tales*) (1995), which documents the medieval presence of specific motifs that were later used in fairy tales, while confirming the absence of fairy tales themselves in the Middle Ages.[34]

Clearly, there is deep opposition to the idea that rise fairy tales first appeared in the sixteenth century and that print and publishing played a primary role in their initial composition and subsequent dissemination. The resistance to *Fairy Godfather*, however, is frequently based on extrapolations from what I have written rather than on my actual reasoning. Because I maintained that there was no evidence of rise fairy tales before Straparola, Cristina Bacchilega concluded that I hold the position "that bearers of oral tradition were not capable of transforming and creating new plots through storytelling" (2007:384). She, Ziolkowski, and Vaz da Silva are also convinced that I equate rise tales with the entire corpus of modern fairy tales, even though the point made in *Fairy Godfather* plainly differed: I argued that Straparola's rise fairy tales, which delineate rags to riches through a magically mediated marriage to royalty, initiated the specific fairy-tale plots that are the most beloved and popular fairy-tale plots in the modern world (Bottigheimer 2002a:6).

A synthesis of ideas from classic and contemporary fairy-tale scholars with interpretations derived the history of print and publishing underlies my reasoning about the formation of rise and restoration fairy tales and their dissemination over great distances and through many centuries. Readers who ponder my conceptualization of rise fairy tales as a new phenomenon in Renaissance Venice will recognize that it is consistent with foundational folk-narrative scholarship, such as Kurt Ranke's understanding of shifts in folklore forms as palpable evidence of their complementarity to historically specific psychological needs. His formulation implicitly recognizes the historicity of tales—that is, their ability to change in response to changing social conditions. (For a concise summary of Ranke's views see Ben-Amos 1976a:xxvii–xxx.) I similarly view human psychological needs as in part conditioned by historical experience.

Speaking from a contemporary point of view, William Hanks understands "genres as historically specific elements of social practice, whose defining features link them to situated communicative acts" (2000:133); that is, he sees genres as social and historical conventions that are specific to individual producers and consumers of oral narrative. While Hanks's evidence comes from a radically different context—Mayan documents from sixteenth-century colonial Yucatan—it allows him to characterize discourse genre in broad terms as consisting "of regular groupings and thematic, stylistic, and compositional elements" (135), a formula that is equally applicable to my distinction between rise and restoration fairy tales. Hanks describes genres as "orienting frameworks, interpretive procedures, and sets of expectations" that lie outside of discourse structure but within performers' language use (135). In other words, his formulations run parallel to the proposition that genres may not be static, but that instead performers' word choices and deliveries can and do alter genres, and furthermore that genre choice itself can be and often is interactive, in that audience expectations are often taken into account by performers.

I understand the emergence of the new genre of rise fairy tales as a response to a new set of audience expectations in Renaissance Venice. The importance of historical context for the genre of rise fairy tales is suggested by Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs's observations that genres are "grounded in and constitutive of structures of social relations," a conceptualization that correlates with postulated financial hopes of urban workers in Renaissance Venice vis-à-vis the acquisition of wealth within a hierarchical society. Bauman further notes that genres indicate "a range of conceptions of speaker and audience" and "a range of possible meanings" (Bauman and Briggs 1992:58), a formulation that creates a semantic space in which rise fairy tales can be considered a genre, if—as I do—you substitute "tale," "book," or "publisher" for "speaker."

Contemporary knowledge of print and publishing history helps solve long-intractable problems in the history of fairy tales, such as otherwise inexplicable gaps in geographical distribution, the presence of unexpectedly similar (or even identical) texts in differing cultures, and the existence of alternative versions of tales within the same cultures. Since the late 1980s, I have used publishing history information to explore a variety of such problems (Bottigheimer 1989b, 1993a, 2003b, 2005b, 2006, 2007). Although my revisions to the history of fairy tales with reference to print differ from interpretations such as Walter Anderson's theory of self-correction (1923), Linda Dégh and Andrew Vázsonyi's theory of conduits (Dégh 1981), and Laurits Bødker's theory of tradition bearers (see Bottigheimer 2006:218–9), my revisions remain consistent with those scholars' *observations* of modern folk knowledge of fairy tales. Anderson himself was open to the possibility of print's primacy; writing in 1935, he declared that "[n]o adherent of the Finnish School will refuse to grant the dependence of oral tradition on literary tradition, when such dependence actually is shown by analysis of all material at hand" (translated in Kiefer [1947] 1973:45; see discussion in Seljamaa 2007). Axel Olrik's epic laws about folk narrative likewise invite thoughtful reflection on the similarity of structural patterns in folk narrative to those in popular print, in particular to popular print that bowdlerizes high literature, a subject that Brynjulf Alver treated in "The Epic Laws of Folk Narrative" (1993). My work on rise fairy tales in historical perspective also fits with Lauri Honko's call for "empirical

studies of the reproduction, performance and communication contexts of genres"
(1989:20). While Honko was a folklorist and had in mind contemporary field obser-
vations, as a literary historian I respond to his call with historical investigations of plot
genesis and publication. Finally, while some critics of my approach have complained
that performance studies have replaced explorations of or searches for origins, I would
note that thinking of the process of publication as "print performance" could be a
legitimate and promising avenue of inquiry.

   In his introduction to this issue, Dan Ben-Amos describes *Fairy Godfather* as an
intellectual challenge that offers "a clear, precise, and well-defined proposition, which
is limited to a specific literary-historical case, [and therefore] could be tested like a
scientific hypothesis" (374). Further, in his article in this issue, Ben-Amos describes
Fairy Godfather as a call to "a reflection upon and re-examination of the very assump-
tions that are at the foundation of folklore studies" (426). Ben-Amos's words, I believe,
imply a recognition that two different methodologies operate in folklore studies today,
a split that goes beyond the anthropological–literary dichotomy that Rosemary Zum-
walt explored in *American Folklore Scholarship* (1988). The folk and fairy tales that
formed the basis for folklore studies when the discipline emerged in the late nineteenth
century were, for the majority of folklore scholars, gathered in tandem with a pre-
formed set of beliefs that folk and fairy tales had maintained a principally oral exis-
tence during earlier centuries. An unwritten oral tradition was posited to account for
the chronological and geographical gaps in these tales' documented existence. These
convictions, and a scholarly method that ignored the absence of evidence of fairy
tales among the folk in the eighteenth century and earlier, remained largely unchal-
lenged in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, when the discipline of
folklore expanded into other verbal, material, and customary practices, solid and
uninterrupted empirical evidence was required—just as is the case in other social
sciences. Careful readers will recognize that *Fairy Godfather*, along with my work as
a whole, applies the empirical methods of modern folklore studies to historical ques-
tions of fairy-tale origins and dissemination.

Concluding Thoughts

Readers of the four articles in this special issue will decide for themselves what course
they wish to follow in future explorations of fairy tales and fairy-tale history. They
may continue within a paradigm formulated in the early nineteenth century and
enshrined by the late nineteenth century[35]—a paradigm that encourages us to render
reports of early modern readings from a book as tellings emanating from a centuries-
long oral tradition and that has come to understand an absence of documentary
evidence as proof for the presence of an oral tradition.[36] They may prefer to believe
that studying the historical phenomenon of the emergence of fairy tales is an out-
dated subject, while continuing to embrace an erroneous theory of oral origins for
Europe's classic fairy tales. Alternatively, they can embark on an empirical study of
fairy tales that searches for evidence, examines original texts in their entirety to de-
termine relationships between content and literary paratext, and places sixteenth- to

eighteenth-century published fairy tales (as well as their nineteenth- and twentieth-century oral counterparts) within sociocultural contexts. This option, which I recommend, goes well beyond the question of origins. It has the potential to provide concrete understandings of the relationships between the stories that publishers printed and the stories that people told.

A growing body of research resonates with new directions for fairy-tale scholarship. In *Russia on the Eve of Modernity* (2008), Leonid Heretz examines elements of Russian folklore long considered to be survivals from ancient Slavic tradition and finds them to be products of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Another historian, Alexandra Walsham, speaks of a "re-enchantment of the world" in the early modern period that is consistent with Straparola's presentation of *this*worldly, rather than *other*worldly, fairies (Walsham 2008). An interdisciplinary Finnish research group led by Anna Kuisman includes intersections between print and folk narrative in its as yet unpublished discussions. A 1988 study of the print precursors of German folk narrative by Manfred Grätz explores the diffusion of French-published fairy tales and fairyland fictions into eighteenth-century Germany. Marilena Papachristophorou (2004) examines the publication history that carried Galland's *Thousand and One Nights* from French through Italian into Greek books and then into Greek oral tradition. Eugene Matusov and John St. Julien (2004) view print literacy as a tool of oppression in an article that offers a template for the spread of European tales into far-distant populations through colonial African and Asian school systems. In exploring the effect of chapbooks on folk readers, Dianne Dugaw maintains that "[a]ttention to printed street literature forces us to question a naïve view of 'the folk' and their 'oral tradition'" (1995:3). Jared Farmer has found that twentieth- and twenty-first-century Ute legends about Utah's Mount Timpanogos were created by Brigham Young University's athletics director, Eugene Roberts, in a "double displacement" of historical Ute identity (2008:3–5). This fabrication is part of a larger pseudo-Indian body of legend that Francis A. de Caro has called a "folklore of guilt" (cited in Farmer 2008:314).

My hope is that historicized discussions will come to characterize tale research; that scholars will begin to distinguish carefully among folktales, fairy tales, and fairyland fictions in a shared terminology; and that the histories and forms of orality associated with each kind of tale will be differentiated in analyses that touch on issues of provenance and dissemination. Ahistorical thinking, deeply ingrained in fairy-tale scholarship, is at odds with literary and historical investigations into the sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century composition and dissemination of fairy tales. It also clashes with folklore-based performance studies of, for instance, nineteenth-century British pantomime (Schacker 2007) and twentieth- and twenty-first-century performances of national identity (Straker 2008). If future research on fairy tales by folklorists is to be consistent with the best historical discourse, then it must be similarly based on evidence rather than on assumptions.

Some of the premises that privilege oralist interpretations have been contradicted by evidence in the study of publishing and book history. In other cases, some evidence—including that which applies to whether or not rise fairy tales existed before Straparola and whether or not rise fairy tales were current among the folk before

Perrault—can be read either in an oralist-privileging way (by assuming that literary versions indicate previously existing oral versions) or in a book history way (by seeking full and documentable references to or examples of fairy-tale tellings). These conflicting approaches result in correspondingly conflicting conclusions. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century data is more straightforward; it supports the existence of rise fairy tales among the folk in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But the belief that such evidence implies the existence of rise fairy tales among the folk in earlier centuries is mere supposition and remains unsupported except by slanted readings. Nor is a report of an old woman telling a story to a child in the ancient world evidence for the existence of an ancient, oral rise fairy-tale tradition. Twenty-first-century scholars need to reread the primary evidence that nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars used to support ideas about orality, because our predecessors often had agendas that motivated them to create folk characters and situations that served their nation-building purposes and that moved them to excise, ignore, or expunge whatever did not serve those purposes. Examples of this abound, such as the effacement of the readings by literate girls and women who provided the Grimms with their first fairy tales, the failure to mention that the Finnish storyteller Blind Stromberg had read many books of stories as a boy before he *became* blind (Herranen 1989),[37] and the removal from the Finnish archives of records of folk tellings that revealed influence from a literary source (Apo 2007:20).

This debate with my colleagues grew from papers delivered at the 2005 Congress of the International Society for Folk Research, in Tartu, Estonia, and at the 2006 meeting of the American Folklore Society, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The seriousness of the disagreement challenges all of us to examine the premises on which studies of Märchen are based, and it requires us to systematize our thoughts.[38] I come away from it persuaded that a study of fairy-tale publishing, a consideration of the history of fairy-tale editing, and a grounding in patterns of literacy offers precious windows into the historical conditions experienced by a variety of folks: ordinary laboring people who were able to read and who lived in sixteenth-century cities and towns; middle-class girls and women who had some leisure time and were the wives, daughters, and sisters of men who were prospering in eighteenth-century Europe; and children and their uneducated elders who were read to or recounted to at home, in schools, or in evening work sessions in the early modern and modern world. The editorial changes made to fairy tales over time chart subtle changes in the producers' understandings of readers' and listeners' expectations, as do editorial changes at social, national, gender, and institutional boundaries. Studies of literacy in societies worldwide point toward the colonial, commercial, and institutional channels within which fairy tales in all probability moved. Meanwhile, studies of contemporary fairy-tale and folktale performances illuminate the ways in which people now use the genre as a whole and rise fairy tales in particular. But no existing studies prove that rise fairy tales circulated in the ancient and medieval worlds or that early modern authors collected their fairy tales from the folk. Instead, both logic and literary evidence demonstrate their 1550s origins.

Appendix: Some Additional Responses to Criticisms Raised in Other Articles in this Issue

Responses to Jan Ziolkowski's "Straparola and the Fairy Tale"

"She does not clarify why she allows hypothesis on the basis of contextual information when constructing a biography but not when piecing together the history of a tale" (386). The contextual information used to construct a possible biography for a man who lived in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is based on fifteenth- and sixteenth-century sources for the location where Straparola can be plausibly placed from the 1480s to the early 1500s (Caravaggio), where he can be placed from about 1549 to his death (Venice), and where it is probable that he earned a living in the meantime (Venice). With reference to plausibility, note that Vaz da Silva, who objects to my attempt to create a biography for Straparola, admits as plausible an argument of surmise when it supports an oralist position, as in his discussion of J. F. Campbell.

"But the texts give evidence of orality, not in a simple dynamic of literary source and its influence on orality (as Bottigheimer would have it), or oral influence that dominates the literary source (as extreme version of folkloristics would contend" (387). Here examples are required. "Evidence of orality" often means nothing more than the presence of an oral style, which skilled wordsmiths often incorporate into their performance. (See the discussion of the Lionbruno texts above.)

"In one [1609] standard historical and etymological dictionary of Italian . . . [the narrative genre of *favole*] do not necessarily stand any lower in the literary hierarchy than do *novelle*; in fact, they may rate as being higher in prestige" (392). On the contrary, Boccaccio described favole, the fourth kind of fictional tale that he discusses in book 14 of his *Genealogia Deorum* (1355), as "inventione delle pazze vecchierelle" (inventions of crazy old women) (Magnanini forthcoming). The introduction to Straparola's first volume (by "Orfeo dalla Carta") simply calls his tales favole, without further descriptors, but by 1572, Girolamo Bargagli had reaffirmed the status of favole as secondary to the novella (due to both the content and the intended audience of favole). In the preface to the first edition of day 1 of Basile's *Cunto de li cunti*, such tales had been further diminutized as *favolette*. Thus, the meaning of the term "favola," like that of the term "Märchen," was not fixed in the early modern period.

Responses to Vaz da Silva's "The Invention of Fairy Tales"

"Most oral fairy tales have no match in known literary sources" (401). This statement requires a three-step response. First, in the compiling of the Finnish archives, all tales collected orally in the field that showed a relationship to printed materials were labeled "trash" and were systematically removed, leaving only oral fairy tales that did not correspond to literary precursors (Apo 2007:19–20). Second, these same Finnish archives provided the template for the Aarne-Thompson tale-type index. Third, Thompson's 1961 revision of the index further reified this artificial divide by including only tales encountered in the field and excluding ones from literary sources (Hansen 2002:22). These three processes effaced existing evidence of oral fairy tales' dependent relationship to literary precursors. Newly recovered information about the publishing dates of fairy-tale collections, however, enables research into the relationship between oral and literary tales to continue.

"[P]overty is but one of many ways to convey lack [in fairy tales]" (409). This statement is true of nineteenth- and twentieth-century fairy tales, but the emotional destitution that Vaz da Silva refers to here played no role in Straparola's sixteenth-century fairy tales.

"Among the stories that Marie de France retells [in her twelve lays], Paul Delarue pinpointed [three fairy tales]" (413). A "conte" can belong to numerous subgenres. Not one of the contes that Marie de France tells in her corpus is a rise fairy tale. Vaz da Silva's terminological slippage exemplifies the problem of understanding a general term used to refer to any tales (conte) as a reference to a specific instance, here rise fairy tales.

"Delarue also notes that a collection of exempla named *Scala Coeli*, collected by a Dominican monk in the early fourteenth century, displays French versions of ATU 505 ('The Grateful Dead'), ATU 551 ('Water of Life'), ATU 671 ('The Three Languages'), and ATU 706 ('The Maiden Without Hands')" (413). The tales cited here contain motifs that recur in modern fairy tales; however, there is not a single rise fairy-tale plot in the *Scala Coeli*.

"However, the fact that in modern Breton tradition variants of ATU 510B are given the title "Peau d'Anette" suggests that, likewise, the 'Cuir d'Asnette' story mentioned by du Fail was a 'Donkeyskin' tale" (414). Chapbook history is rife with identical titles fronting very different texts. It is equally misleading to assume that a tale gathered in the modern era can be equated with a tale as it existed before 1694, when Perrault's "Peau d'Asne" first appeared.

"It entails recognizing that the complex tradition of ATU 300 ['The Dragon Slayer'], which extends throughout the Indo-European landscape and beyond, could not derive from Straparola's version by means of French literary channels" (419). I have never attributed "Dragon Slayer" tales to Straparola. They are ancient in origin, though they had only princely protagonists until Straparola introduced poor heroes into his narratives. This argument is irrelevant to the discussion of those tales that did, in fact, pass through French literary channels.

Notes

I am very grateful to Suzanne Magnanini, Betsey Harries, Kathrin Pöge-Alder, and Karl Bottigheimer for their help in reviewing this article. I also want to thank the outside readers for the *Journal of American Folklore*, who provided incisive comments, Jesse L. Rester, whose consummate copyediting improved the presentation and flow of ideas, and Heather Munson, whose patience and understanding were immeasurably supportive in the final edit.

1. I use historians' standard definition of "early modern" as 1500–1789 and "modern" as 1790–1945.

2. This observation is based on an examination of the plots of brief narratives in the ancient world, the Middle Ages, and the early modern period, which I explored in *Fairy Godfather* in conjunction with my earlier research. Part of this research has been published as "Fertility Control and the Birth of the Modern Fairy Tale Heroine" (Bottigheimer 2000a).

3. An initial sense of this proliferation can be gained by examining the published listings of Boiardo's and Ariosto's *Orlando* romances and their extensions in the *National Union Catalog of pre-1956 Imprints* (Cole 1981). The subject has also been analyzed in depth by Jane Everson in *The Italian Romance Epic in the Age of Humanism* (2001).

4. "Robert the Devil," part of the widely influential *Scala Coeli*, reached listeners all over Europe (see Gobi 1991; Berlioz 2004, cols. 735–6). The central importance of sermon tales as a formative component for subsequent Märchen is pointed out by Viera Gašparíková (2000:257).

5. In a third group of stories, Straparola lengthened a rise fairy tale by adding a restoration fairy tale to it. In this case, a poor person rises by marrying royalty, and then that newly royal figure leaves or is expelled from his or her royal estate, suffers, and is eventually restored to royal position. These I call "compound fairy tales."

6. Discussing the Egyptian tale of "The Two Brothers," Wettengel tellingly comments: "If one follows the arguments of narrative research, it does not seem acceptable to classify the text of the Orbiney papyrus as a Märchen simply because a couple of its motifs have been transmitted in folk tales down to the present day" (2006:4, my translation).

7. Here, I will not delve into a discussion of the manuscript and print history of "Whittington's Cat," except to note that a similar tale, describing a man richly rewarded for ridding a king's ship of mice, appeared in Nicholas de Troyes's *Le grand Parangon des nouvelles nouvelles* ([1518] 1970). This precedes the English-language record of this kind of tale in conjunction with Dick Whittington, which is to be found in an early seventeenth-century play, subsequent ballads, and finally a 1670 "biography" (Daniels 2007).

8. Propp's theory has been integrated into structural semantics, generative grammar, mathematical logic, information theory, and semiotics, among other fields (Voigt 2002, col. 1436).

9. A modern example of the limited utility of Proppian analysis emerges from Alan Dundes's (1964a)

investigation of North American folktales: none of his examples include more than six of Propp's thirty-one functions. Elstein and Lipsker make much the same point: "Propp's disregard for the historical context and his failure to take into account the socio-cultural factors were counter-productive not only in so far as the relationship between the (Proppian) functions are concerned, but also in terms of the relationship between different narratives. He thus unwittingly undermined the most important basis of comparison in the research of comparative literature" (2004:10).

10. It was only after the revival of the ancient classics that authors used the motif of the hero's persuading his opponent to change into a form that the hero could easily overcome: in ancient times, Hesiod reports Zeus tricking his wife Hera into becoming a fly that he then swallows (discussed in Lang 1888:lxxi). Many years later, Straparola's Dionigi becomes a fox and eats his changed-into-a-rooster opponent, and Perrault has his Puss in Boots persuade the ogre to assume the shape of a mouse. Is the long absence of this motif accidental, or did the rebirth of the classics in the early Renaissance return it to circulation?

11. Ben-Amos, in his article in this issue (442 n. 8), makes a claim similar to Vaz da Silva's when he imputes a long history to the African tales analyzed in 1976 by Denise Paulme. Although Ben-Amos ascribes to these tales a timeless and enduring quality, we must question his assumption that tales collected in twentieth-century Africa had long existed in an identical form or with the same characteristics. That assumption ignores or bypasses fundamental questions. When were the tales first collected? How can (or do) we know how long they had existed in the form in which they were collected? What kind of evidence demonstrates that they existed prior to the 1550s? No answers to these questions are produced to validate Ben-Amos's inference that the African tales in question had existed for centuries in the same form in which Paulme documents them. For concrete counterexamples, see Sigrid Schmidt's 1991 studies of borrowed German tale material among the Nama and Damara in Namibia.

12. The *Blaue Bibliothek aller Nationen* (Blue library of all nations) (Bertuch [1790–1800] 1990–1994) provides one example of a wildly successful early distribution of Perrault's "Puss in Boots," along with his other tales, in Germany. It is worth noting that the Grimms' first edition also contains some of Perrault's tales. In 1812, the Grimms believed that these were German folk tales, but they were excised from the second edition after the Grimms became aware of their French origin.

13. I am currently working on a history of fairy tales that discusses Middle Eastern tales extensively; a detailed discussion of the Hikayat will appear in this book.

14. I have written several articles treating genre distinctions within folk narrative, including articles that discuss the distinguishing characteristics of fairy tales and closely related genres (see Bottigheimer 1989a, 1999, 2002b, 2003a, 2004a, 2004b, 2006).

15. Stith Thompson characterized Märchen as a whole in terms that I would categorize as a rise fairy-tale plot, stressing the heroes' humble origins and their marriage and advancement: "The German *Märchen . . .* is well agreed on. A *Märchen* is a tale of some length involving a succession of motifs or episodes. It moves in an unreal world without definite locality or definite characters and is filled with the marvelous. In this never-never land humble heroes kill adversaries, succeed to kingdoms, and marry princesses" ([1946] 1977:8).

16. Michael Kearney's *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry* (1996) subjects the inception, growth, and demise of the concept of "peasant" in anthropology to a close scrutiny. His critique historicizes the concept of "peasant" and demonstrates problems with the idea that the "folk" were isolated from the influences of international sources. His discussion has much to offer to scholars of folk narrative. Steve Newman's reference to old women and nurses as sources for ballads in *Ballad Collection, Lyric, and the Canon* (2007:70), for example, suggests that there are parallel problems in ballad scholarship.

17. Numerous sixteenth- and seventeenth-century French authors mentioned the term "conte de peau d'asne." Scarron, for instance, uses it in his 1651 *Roman comique* (78). When Perrault invokes the term in the second volume of *Parallèle*, he uses generic language: "Les fables milésiennes sont si puériles que c'est leur faire assez d'honneur que de leur opposer nos [by which he means his own] contes de *peau d'ane* et de la Mère l'Oye" (The Milesian tales are so childish that it does them enough honor to contrast [them] with our [my] donkeyskin and mother goose tales") (quoted in Deulin [1879] 1969:10, my translation; the spelling "ane" is the modern variant of "asne"). Note that Perrault speaks not of his *Conte de Peau d'Asne* but in the plural of his *contes de peau d'asne*. Since he had only one *conte* entitled "Peau d'Asne," he is obviously using the term in a generic fashion, much the same way that Jean de La Fontaine did in

his much-cited reference to taking pleasure in being told peau d'asne ([1668] 2002:239; see also Bottigheimer 2007:151).

18. The discussion is based on the following passage by Marc Soriano: "Le critique anonyme du Recueil Moetjens reproche précisément à l'Académicien de ne pas avoir répandu 'un peu de son bon esprit sur la fable' et l'avoir donnée telle qu'elle se débite aujourd'hui après avoir 'passé au travers de plusieurs siècles par les mains d'un peuple fort imbécile de nourrices et de petits enfants'" (The anonymous critic of the Moetjens Collection upbraids the Academician [Perrault was a member of the French Academy] for not having sprinkled "a little of his wit onto the fable" and for having presented it just the way it is spouted today after having "passed during the course of several centuries through the hands of a population of idiots composed of nannies and little children") (1977:113–4).

19. The proceedings of this conference were recently published by Maeve McCusker and Janice Carruthers (2009). Regrettably, John Conteh-Morgan died before he could prepare his provocative paper for publication.

20. In his foreword to a volume of Russian tales, Jacob Grimm recognized the similarity of German tales to French and Italian ones while denying that one national tale tradition had directly borrowed from another. For him, darkness shrouded tales' dissemination ("über ihrer Verbreitung schwebt ein Dunkel") ([1831] 1884:145). The editor of the Russian tale collection for which Grimm composed the foreword notes that some of the texts (tales number 11 and number 12) were new and not known among the folk and that one (tale number 15) was probably a French import (see Grimm [1831] 1884:259–68).

21. The ATU index mentions Sercambi's eleventh tale. In Giovanni Sinicropi's 1972 edition of this work, the three "brothers" in the eleventh tale are religious brothers (monks), who do not perform wondrous deeds but are intent on seducing Ranieri's wife. In Luciano Rossi's 1974 edition, the numbering differs, and the Ranieri tale is located as number 10. However, number 11 in Rossi's edition tells a similar story, in which the seducers are priests rather than monkish brothers. The only explanation that I can see for the ATU listing of Sercambi's eleventh tale under 513A is that it was based on a misreading of Sercambi.

22. Straparola retained this dystopic conclusion for his own, non–rise fairy-tale version (night 7, story 5): "But with regard to the lady, seeing it was not possible to divide her into three parts, there arose a sharp dispute between the brothers as to which one of them should retain her, and the wrangling over this point, to decide who had the strongest claim, was very long. Indeed, up to this present day it is still before the court; wherefore we will each settle the cause as we think right, while the judge keeps us waiting for his decision" (Straparola [1551–1553] 1898, vol. 3:80).

23. Johnson (1997:180) points out that Aspasia is indeed a historical figure as presented by Plutarch (*Artaxerxes* 26.6, 27.4) and Xenophon (*Anabasis* 1.10.2).

24. The relevant effects of poverty are specified, for example, in the following passage: "Of womanish meddlesomeness and curiosity she was utterly free. For wealth tends to encourage such habits as these, but because she was a poor girl, raised by a father who was himself a poor man, she added to her beauty nothing superfluous nor distracting" (Johnson 1997:162–3).

25. This focus on sexuality can be seen in the story elements that elaborate on the relation between Cyrus and the courtesans (among whom Aspasia was placed). The text emphasizes that Aspasia was taken "by force" and "against her will" and that she refused to dress her hair or her body or wear cosmetics. It further reports that instructors had taught the other girls "how they were to insinuate themselves with Cyrus, to flatter him . . . not to repel him nor to be provoked when he touched them but to endure his kisses. . . . [They were] all well-trained in the lessons of courtesans and in the arts of women who make a profit from their beauty . . . [they were] eager to outdo each other in seductiveness." Aspasia was an exception; she "firmly believed that to endure upon her body the strange garment and the excessive adornment was pure and manifest slavery. They beat her and forced her to dress in this manner. She yielded to their orders, distressed that she was forced into doing things that befit not maidens but hetaerae. . . . When Cyrus only touched her with the tip of his finger, she shrieked and . . . stood up and tried to escape when Cyrus touched her bosom. . . . [Cyrus said] "This girl is the only one you brought who is free-born and uncorrupted. . . . Thereupon Cyrus loved her more than any of the women with whom he had ever consorted. Later he developed a sincere passion for her and was loved by her in turn" (Johnson 1997:163–4).

26. Aspasia has been described as "the chief of [Artaxerxes's] wives" (Johnson 1997:165), but this

position as principal concubine differs greatly from the status associated with a royal wedding in more recent times. Aspasia's status as described by Claudius Aelianus is that of particularly valuable—and transferable—property, while Plutarch's account conveys a sense of voluntary choice in her mobile sexual affiliations.

27. The "Solomon's Daughter" and "Joshua's Daughter" tales cited by Ben-Amos contain a bird/boy/tower conjunction that is similar to motifs found in the late twelfth-century *Lais* of Marie de France (1978). In his introduction to Bin-Gorion's *Mimekor Yisrael*, Ben-Amos recognizes that Marie's collection and the roughly contemporaneous medieval animal fable collection, *Mishlei Shu'alim*, share several fables that are unknown in other collections from the same period (Bin-Gorion 1976:li). Michael Chernick (2007) proposes that Rabbi Berechiah ben Natronai ha-Naqdan (who translated Marie de France's *Ysopet* into Hebrew) is a likely conduit between Christian court culture and Jewish fabulists. According to Susan Einbinder (2001), French-language romance motifs and techniques can be identified in twelfth-century Jewish writings, even in religious texts such as martyrdom narratives. For an allusion to similar borrowing in a Jewish–Italian context, see Landau (1916:469 n. 2).

28. "'The Omnipotent,' said a Rabbi, 'is occupied in making marriages'" (Abrahams 1890:172). To support this point, Israel Abrahams mentions a story about King Solomon, "an Agadic story, in which the force of this predestination is shown to be too strong even for royal opposition" (176). In the version of "Solomon's Daughter" recounted by Abrahams, the future son-in-law is explicitly described as "the poorest man in the nation" (176), while the tale ends with Solomon's words, "Blessed is the Omnipresent who giveth a wife to man and establisheth him in his house" (177). This nineteenth-century version of the story thus presents a more explicit economic context, while retaining the centrality of the message about God's authority.

29. In his discussion of the definition of Märchen, Ben-Amos has also argued against determining genre solely by content (1976b:218).

30. This argument rests on countable numbers of surviving books and documented publishing strategies in Renaissance Venice. "Countable" refers to estimates of the number of copies in a single print run and to the verification of the actual number of print runs based on the comparison of publishing "fingerprints" (leaf markings, often positioned measurably differently in different print runs; see Bottigheimer 2005a: 13–6).

31. Frykman and Lofgren analyze the middle-class creation and institutionalization of concepts of folk purity. Hobsbawm and Ranger's essays on clan tartans, Highland kilts, royal pageantry, and "native" traditions in colonial Africa and India treat numerous traditions that are, in fact, late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century inventions designed to serve ideological purposes. Hobsbawm's definition of "tradition" as "a set of practices . . . of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past" (1983:1) corresponds to efforts in nineteenth-century nation-building states to legitimate patently specious claims of national cohesion based on folk identity.

32. Albert Wesselski's *Versuch einer Theorie des Märchens* (Towards a theory of the tale) ([1931] 1974:153, 156–7) makes much the same argument about relying on textual sources rather than on reports of storytelling events where story content is unknown. Wesselski's points are developed in Pöge-Alder's *"Märchen" als mündlich tradierte Tradition des Volkes?* (Tales as an oral tradition of the folk?) (1994).

33. I have recently developed this point in an essay entitled "Fairies, Elves, and Fairy Tales" (2009b). It is worth noting that the process of generic innovation has been noted by literary scholars such as Julia Kristeva and Mikhail Bakhtin, whose work plays a part in Bauman's thinking about genre (Bauman and Briggs 1992:145–7) and "generic intertextuality" (131).

34. Clausen-Stolzenburg is one of many researchers who have actively sought fairy tales in the Middle Ages and who have noted the absence of tales with the popular modern plot of rags-to-riches through magic and marriage in that period. Others who come to the same conclusion include Hans-Jörg Uther (1990), Albert Wesselski (1925), and Dietrich Wolfzettel (2005).

35. At the founding of national folklore societies in the late 1800s, folktales and fairy tales were the principal, often the sole, subject of study. This is well known, but I add it here to make clear that the paradigm of folk origination is fundamentally involved with the one-time preeminence of folk-narrative studies within the discipline of folklore, in an era which has now passed.

36. An often-cited example is Noël du Fail's 1548 account of "bon homme Robin" reading from a book to assembled listeners. References generally elide the reading and substitute a verb of "telling" or "recounting."

37. Nowhere is Vaz da Silva's approach to fairy-tale scholarship as clear as in his unquestioning acceptance of the icon of a blind storyteller (402). Since Gun Herranen (1989) exposed the fiction that "Blind Stromberg's" life was bookless, caution has become desirable when categorical conditions such as blind storytellers are promoted.

38. Readers will undoubtedly have noted that neither Hans Naumann nor Albert Wesselski appears as an authoritative source in this article. That is by design: I wanted to make the argument for historicity based solely on evidence rather than by relying on previous conclusions about "gesunkenes Kulturgut" (Naumann 1929:8) that many still find inflammatory.

References Cited

Abrahams, Israel. 1890. Marriages Are Made in Heaven. *Jewish Quarterly Review* 2:172–7.

Abrahams, Roger D. 1976. The Complex Relations of Simple Forms. In *Folklore Genres*, ed. Dan Ben-Amos, pp. 193–214. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Afanas'ev, Aleksandr Nikolayevich. [1855–1863] 1975. *Russian Fairy Tales*, trans. Norbert Guterman. New York: Pantheon.

Alver, Brynjulf. 1993. The Epic Laws of Folk Narrative. In *Telling Reality: Folklore Studies in Memory of Bengt Holbek*, ed. Michael Chesnutt, pp. 195–204. Copenhagen: NIF Publications.

Anderson, Graham. 2000. *Fairytale in the Ancient World*. New York: Routledge.

Anderson, Walter. 1923. *Kaiser und Abt*. FF Communications 42. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Apo, Satu. 2007. The Relationship between Oral and Literary Tradition as a Challenge in Fairy-Tale Research. *Marvels and Tales* 21(1):19–33.

d'Aulnoy, Marie-Catherine. [1690] 2004. *Madame d'Aulnoy: Contes des Fées suivis des Contes nouveaux ou Les Fées à la Mode*, ed. Nadine Jasmin. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Bacchilega, Cristina. 2007. Review of *Fairy Godfather*. *Western Folklore* 66(3–4):383–5.

Bacchilega, Cristina, and Noelani Arista. 2004. The *Arabian Nights* in a Nineteenth-Century Hawaiian Newspaper: Reflections on the Politics of Translation. *Fabula* 45(3–4):189–206.

Barth, John. 1984. *The Friday Book, or, Book-Titles Should be Straightforward and Subtitles Avoided: Essays and Other Nonfiction*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Bascom, William. 1965. The Form of Folklore: Prose Narratives. *Journal of American Folklore* 78(307):3–20.

Basile, Giambattista. [1634–1636] 2007. *The Tale of Tales, or, Entertainment for Little Ones*, trans. Nancy Canepa. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

———. 1637. *Del Teagene*. Rome: P. A. Facciotti.

Bauman, Richard, and Charles Briggs. 1992. Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2(2):131–72.

Beit-Arié, Malachi. 1985. Ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. OR 135. *Tarbiz* 54(4):631–4.

Belcher, Stephen. 1994. Framed Tales in the Oral Tradition: An Exploration. *Fabula* 35(1–2):1–19.

Ben-Amos, Dan. 1976a. Introduction to *Folklore Genres*, ed. Dan Ben-Amos, pp. ix–xlv. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1976b. Analytical Categories and Ethnic Genres. In *Folklore Genres*, ed. Dan Ben-Amos, pp. 215–42. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Berlioz, Jacques. 2004. Robert der Teufel. In *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 11, cols. 734–41. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Berlioz, Jacques, Claude Brémond, and Catharine Velay-Vallantin. 1989. *Formes médiévales du conte merveilleux*. Paris: Stock.

Bertuch, Friedrich Justin. [1790–1800] 1990–1994. *Blaue Bibliothek aller Nationen*, ed. Hans-Jörg Uther. Munich: Saur.

Bin-Gorion, Mischa Joseph. 1976. *Mimekor Yisrael: Classical Jewish Folktales*, ed. Emanuel bin Gorion, trans. I. M. Lask, intro. Dan Ben-Amos. 3 vols. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

———. 1990. *Mimekor Yisrael: Classical Jewish Folktales. Abridged and Annotated Edition*, ann. Dan Ben-Amos. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bliss, A. J., ed. 1966. *Sir Orfeo*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. [1353] 1962. *Decameron*, trans. Richard Aldington. New York: Dell.

Bolte, Johannes, and Jiří Polívka. [1913–1932] 1963. *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm*. 5 vols. Hildesheim: Olms.

Bottigheimer, Ruth B. 1989a. German Fairy Tales. *The Literary Encyclopedia*. http://www.litencyc.com, accessed October 17, 2009.

———. 1989b. Fairy Tales, Folk Narrative Research, and History. *Social History* 14(3):343–57.

———. 1993a. Irving, Washington. In *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 7, pp. 294–6. Berlin: De Gruyter.

———. 1993b. Luckless, Witless, and Filthy-Footed: A Socio-Cultural Study and Publishing History Analysis of "The Lazy Boy" (AT 675). *Journal of American Folklore* 106(421):259–84.

———. 1999. Fairy Tales. In *Encyclopedia of German Literature*, ed. Matthias Konzett, vol. 1, pp. 267–70. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

———. 2000a. Fertility Control and the Birth of the Modern Fairy Tale Heroine. *Marvels and Tales* 14(1):64–79.

———. 2000b. Musäus, Johann Karl August. In *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*, ed. Jack Zipes, pp. 329–30. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2002a. *Fairy Godfather: Straparola, Venice, and the Fairy Tale Tradition*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———. 2002b. Märchen. In *Lexikon Gender Studies*, ed. Renate Kroll, pp. 253–4. Stuttgart: Metzler.

———. 2003a. Fairy Tales and Fables. In *History of Childhood*, ed. Paula S. Fass, vol. 2, pp. 337–9. New York: Macmillan.

———. 2003b. The Ultimate Fairy Tale: Oral Transmission in a Literate World. In *The Companion to the Fairy Tale*, ed. Hilda Davidson, Anna Chaudhri, and Derek Brewer, pp. 57–70. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer.

———. 2004a. Fairy Tales and Folk Tales. In *International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature*, 2nd ed., ed. Peter Hunt, vol. 1, pp. 261–74. London: Routledge.

———. 2004b. Folk and Fairy Tales. In *Europe 1450 to 1789: Encyclopaedia of the Early Modern World*, ed. Jonathan Dewald, vol. 2, pp. 408–10. New York: Scribner.

———. 2005a. The Book on the Bookseller's Shelf and the Book in the English Child's Hand. In *Culturing the Child 1690–1914: Essays in Honor of Mitzi Myers*, ed. Donelle Ruwe, pp. 3–28. Lanhan, MD: Scarecrow.

———. 2005b. France's First Fairy Tales: The Restoration and Rise Narratives of *Les Facetieuses Nuictz du Seigneur François Straparole. Marvels and Tales* 19(1):17–31.

———. 2006. Fairy-Tale Origins, Fairy-Tale Dissemination, and Folk Narrative Theory. *Fabula* 47(3–4):211–21.

———. 2007. Perrault au travail. In *Le conte en ses paroles: La figuration de l'oralité dans le conte merveilleux du Classicisme aux Lumières*, ed. Anne Defrance and Jean-François Perrin, pp. 150–9. Paris: Desjonquères.

———. 2008. Before *Contes du Temps Passé* (1697): Charles Perrault's "Grisélidis" (1691), "Souhaits Ridicules" (1693), and "Peau d'Asne" (1694). *Romanic Review* 99(2):175–89.

———. 2009a. *Fairy Tales: A New History*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

———. 2009b. Fairies, Elves, and Fairy Tales. Keynote lecture, Eighth Biennial Conference on Modern Critical Approaches to Children's Literature. March 26–28, 2009, Nashville, TN. Sponsored by Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro.

Brémond, Claude. 1973. *Logique du récit*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Briggs, Charles L., and Richard Bauman. 1999. "The Foundation of All Future Researches": Franz Boas, George Hunt, Native American Texts, and the Construction of Modernity. *American Quarterly* 51(3):479–528.

Briggs, Katharine. 1976. *An Encyclopedia of Fairies, Hobgoblins, Brownies, Bogies, and Other Supernatural Creatures*. New York: Pantheon.

———. 1978. *The Vanishing People: Fairy Lore and Legends*. New York: Pantheon.

Burke, Peter. [1978] 2009. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Carpenter, Rhys. 1946. *Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chernick, Michael. 2007. Marie de France in the Synagogue. *Exemplaria* 19(1):183–205.

Chojnacki, Stanley. 2000. *Women and Men in Renaissance Venice: Twelve Essays on Patrician Society*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cirino of Ancona. [1476] 1976. *The Story of Lionbruno*, trans. Beatrice Corrigan. Toronto: Toronto Public Library.

———. 2002. Liombruno: MS Antonelli 521: Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea di Ferrara. In *Cantari Novellistici dal Tre al Cinquecento*, ed. Roberta Manetti, vol. 1, pp. 301–39. Rome: Salerno Editrice.

Clausen-Stolzenburg, Maren. 1995. *Märchen und mittelalterliche Literaturtradition: Zur Entstehung der Kinder- und Hausmärchen*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Clinton, Jerome. 1986. Madness and Cure in the *Thousand and One Nights*. In *Fairy Tales and Society: Illusion, Allusion, and Paradigm*, ed. Ruth B. Bottigheimer, pp. 35–51. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Cole, John Young, ed. 1981. *National Union Catalog of pre-1956 Imprints*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Daniels, Morna. 2007. Dick Whittington. *Children's Book History Society Newsletter* 88:13–7.

Day, Lal Behari. 1883. *Folk Tales of Bengal*. London: Macmillan.

Dégh, Linda. 1981. Conduit-Theorie. In *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 3, pp. 124–6. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Deulin, Charles. [1879] 1969. *Les contes de ma mere l'oye avant Perrault*. Geneva: Slatkine.

Douglas, Mary. 2007. *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

du Fail, Noël. [1548] 1994. *Propos rustiques*. Geneva: Droz.

Dugaw, Dianne. 1995. Chapbook Publishing and the "Lore" of the "Folks." In *The Other Print Tradition: Essays on Chapbooks, Broadsides, and Related Ephemera*, ed. Cathy Lynn Preston and Michael J. Preston, pp. 3–18. New York: Garland.

Dundes, Alan. *The Morphology of North American Folktales*. FF Communications 195. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

———. 1964b. Texture, Text, and Context. *Southern Folklore Quarterly* 28:251–65.

Earl, Brian. 1992–1993. Supernatural Legends in Nineteenth-Century Irish Writing. *Béaloideas* 60–1:93–144.

Einbinder, Susan. 2001. Signs of Romance: Hebrew Prose and the Twelfth-century Renaissance. In *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-century Europe*, ed. Michael A. Signer and John van Engen, pp. 221–33. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Elstein, Yoav. 2004. The Theme of "The King Doughter [*sic*] Locked-Up in a Tower": The Unfolding of the Versions from *Midrash Tanhuma* to Bialik's "Legend of the Three and the Four." In *Encyclopedia of the Jewish Story*, ed. Yoav Elstein, Avidov Lipsker, and Relah Kushelevsky, pp 79–104. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press.

Elstein, Yoav, and Avidov Lipsker. 2004. The Homogeneous Series in the Literature of the Jewish People: A Thematological Methodology, trans. Ruth Bar-Ilan. http://www.biu.ac.il/js/thematology/essay.html#1, accessed December 1, 2009.

Everson, Jane. 2001. *The Italian Romance Epic in the Age of Humanism: The Matter of Italy and the World of Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farmer, Jared. 2008. *On Zion's Mount: Mormons, Indians, and the American Landscape*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

French, Fiona. 1998. *Jamil's Clever Cat: A Folk Tale from Bengal*. London: Lincoln.

Frow, John. 2007. The Literary Frame. *Blesok* 55:1–4.

Frykman, Jonas, and Orvar Lofgren. [1979] 1987. *Culture Builders: A Historical Anthropology of Middle-Class Life*, trans. Alan Crozier. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Gašparíková, Viera, ed. 2000. *Slowakische Volksmärchen*, trans. Wilfried Fiedler. Munich: Diederichs.

Georges, Robert A., and Michael Owen Jones. 1995. *Folkloristics: An Introduction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gittes, Katherine Slater. 1983. The Canterbury Tales and the Arabic Frame Tradition. *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 98(2):237–51.

———. 1991. *Framing the "Canterbury Tales": Chaucer and the Medieval Frame Narrative Tradition*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Gobi, Johannes, Jr. 1991. *La Scala coeli de Johannes Gobi*, ed. Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu. Paris: Édition du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Grätz, Manfred. 1988. *Das Märchen in der deutschen Aufklärung: Vom Feenmärchen zum Volksmärchen*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Grimm, Jacob. [1831] 1884. Vorwort. In *Russische Volksmärchen in den Urschriften gesammelt und ins Deutsche übersetzt von Anton Dietrich*, ed. Anton Dietrich, vol. 8, pp. 145–7. Berlin: Ferd Dümmler.

Grimm, Jacob, and Wilhelm Grimm. 1812–1815. *Kinder- und Haus-Märchen. Gesammelt durch die Brüder Grimm*. 2 vols. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung.

Guézennec, Nathalie. 2009. La mémoire de conteurs bretons. *Fabula* 50(1):1–21.

Haberman, A. M. 1975. *Hadashim gam Yeshanim: Texts Old and New*. Jerusalem: Rubin Mass.

Hanks, William. 1989. Text and Textuality. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18:95–127.

———. 2000. *Writings on Language, Utterance, and Context*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Hansen, William. 2002. *Ariadne's Thread. A Guide to International Tales Found in Classical Literature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Harf-Lancner, Laurence. 1984. *Les fées au moyen âge: Morgane et Mélusine: La naissance des fées*. Paris: Champion.

Haring, Lee. 2004. Framing in Oral Narrative. *Marvels and Tales* 18(2):229–45.

———. 2007. Framing in Narrative. In *The Arabian Nights in Transnational Perspective*, ed. Ulrich Marzolph, pp. 135–53. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Harries, Elizabeth. 2001. *Twice Upon a Time: Women Writers and the History of the Fairy Tale*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Henry of Huntingdon. 1991. *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon*, trans. and ed. Thomas Forester. Felinfach, Wales: Llanerch.

Heretz, Leonid. 2008. *Russia on the Eve of Modernity: Popular Religion and Traditional Culture under the Last Tsars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herranen, Gun. 1989. A Big Ugly Man with a Quest for Narratives. In *Studies in Oral Narrative*, ed. Anna-Leena Sikkala, pp. 64–9. Studia Fennica 33. Helsinki: Suomalainen kirjakisuuden seura.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Honko, Lauri. 1989. Folkloristic Theories of Genre. In *Studies in Oral Narrative,* ed. Anna-Leena Sikkala, pp. 13–38. Studia Fennica 33. Helsinki: Suomalainen kirjakisuuden seura.

Irwin, Bonnie D. 1995. What's in a Frame? The Medieval Textualization of Traditional Storytelling. *Oral Tradition* 10(1):27–53.

Jakobson, Roman, and Petr Bogatyrev. [1929] 1982. Folklore as a Special Form of Creativity. In *The Prague School: Selected Writings, 1929–1946*, ed. Peter Steiner, trans. Manfred Jacobson, pp. 32–46. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Johnson, Diane Ostrom. 1997. *An English Translation of Claudius Aelianus' Varia Historia*. Lewiston, ME: Edward Mellen Press.

Jolles, André. 1965. *Einfache Formen: Legende, Sage, Mythe, Rätsel, Spruch, Kasus, Memorabile, Märchen, Witz*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kearney, Michael. 1996. *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry: Anthropology in Global Perspective*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Kiefer, Emma Emily. [1947] 1973. *Albert Wesselski and Recent Folktale Theories*. New York: Haskell House.

Kirk, Robert. [1691] 1976. *The Secret Commonwealth of Elves, Fauns, and Fairies*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Kugler, Hartmut. 2002. Ovid. In *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 10, cols. 458–64. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kuwada, Bryan. 2009. How Blue *Is* His Beard? An Examination of the 1862 Hawaiian-Language Translation of "Bluebeard." *Marvels and Tales* 23(1):17–39.

La Fontaine, Jean de. [1668] 2002. *Fables*, ed. Jean-Charles Darmon and Sabine Gruffat. Paris: Le Livre de Poche.

Landau, L. 1916. A German-Italian Satire on The Ages of Man. *Modern Language Notes* 31(8):465–71.

Lang, Andrew. 1888. Introduction to *Perrault's Popular Tales, Edited from the Original Editions with Introduction*, ed. Andrew Lang, pp. vii–cxv. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Laskaya, Anne, and Eve Salisbury, eds. 1995. *The Middle Breton Lays*. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications.

Lommatzsch, Erhard. 1950–1951. *Beiträge zur älteren italienischen Volksdichtung: Untersuchungen und Texte*. 4 vols. Berlin: Akademieverlag.

Magnanini, Suzanne, intro. and trans. Forthcoming. Giovanni Boccaccio, *The Genealogy of the Gods* (1355). In *The Classic Fairy Tales: Forewords, Afterwords, and Critical Words*, ed. Ruth B. Bottigheimer. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Marie de France. 1978. *The Lais of Marie de France*, ed. Robert W. Hanning and Joan M. Ferrante. New York: Dutton.

Marzolph, Ulrich, ed. 1999. *Das Buch der wundersamen Geschichten*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Matusov, Eugene, and John St. Julien. 2004. Print Literacy as Oppression: Cases of Bureaucratic, Colonial, and Totalitarian Literacies and their Implications for Schooling. *Text* 24(2):197–244.

McCusker, Maeve, and Janice Carruthers, eds. 2009. *The Conte: Oral and Written Dynamics*. New York: Peter Lang.

Musäus, Johann Karl August. [1782–1787] 1961. *Volksmährchen der Deutschen*. Munich: Winkler.

Naubert, Benedikte. [1789–1793] 2001. *Neue Volksmährchen der Deutschen*. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Naumann, Hans. 1929. *Grundzüge der deutschen Volkskunde*. Leipzig: Quelle and Meyer.

Newman, Steve. 2007. *Ballad Collection, Lyric, and the Canon: The Call of the Popular from the Restoration to the New Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nicholas de Troyes. [1518] 1970. *Le grand Parangon des nouvelles nouvelles*, ed. Krystyna Kasprzyk. Paris: M. Didier.

Oergel, Maike. 2006. *Culture and Ideality: Historicity in German Literature and Thought 1770–1815*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Oring, Elliot. 1986. Folk Narratives. In *Folk Groups and Folklore Genres: An Introduction*, ed. Elliot Oring, pp. 121–45. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Papachristophorou, Marilena. 2004. The Arabian Nights in Greece: A Comparative Survey of Greek Oral Tradition. *Fabula* 45(3–4):311–29.

Paredes, Américo, and Richard Bauman, eds. [1972] 2000. *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore*. Bloomington, IN: Trickster Press.

Perrault, Charles. 1697. *Histoires, ou Contes du Temps passé*. The Hague: Moetjens.

Pirovano, Donato. 2000. Una storia editoriale cinquecentesca: "Le piacevoli notti" di Giovan Francesco Straparola. *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 177(580):540–69.

———. 2001. Per l'edizione de Le Piacevoli Notti di Giovan Francesco Straparola. *Filologia e Critica* 26(1):60–93.

Pöge-Alder, Kathrin. 1994. *"Märchen" als mündlich tradierte Erzählungen des Volkes?* Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

———. 2007. *Märchenforschung: Theorien, Methoden, Interpretationen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Polo de Beaulieu, Ann. 1992. *Les Exempla Médiévaux: Nouvelles perspectives*. Paris: H. Champion.

Propp, Vladimir. [1928] 1958. *Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. Laurence Scott and Svatava Pirkova-Jakobson. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Rölleke, Heinz. 1986. The "Utterly Hessian" Fairy Tales by "Old Marie": The End of a Myth, trans. Ruth B. Bottigheimer. In *Fairy Tales and Society: Illusion, Allusion, and Paradigm*, ed. Ruth B. Bottigheimer, pp. 287–300. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Roussineau, Gilles. 1979–2007. *Le Roman de Perceforest*. Geneva: Droz.

Rubini, Luisa. 2003. Fortunatus in Italy: A History between Translations, Chapbooks, and Fairy Tales. *Fabula* 44(1–2):25–54.

Scarron, Paul. [1651] 1980. *Le roman comique*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.

Schacker, Jennifer. 2007. Unruly Tales: Ideology, Anxiety, and the Regulation of Genre. *Journal of American Folklore* 120(478):381–400.

Schenda, Rudolf. 1961. *Die französische Prodigienliteratur in der zweiten Hälfte des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*. Munich: M. Hueber.

———. 1970. *Volk ohne Buch: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der populären Lesestoffe 1770–1910*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.

———. 1976. *Die Lesestoffe der kleinen Leute: Studien zur populären Literatur im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

———. 2007. Semiliterate and Semi-Oral Processes, trans. Ruth B. Bottigheimer. *Marvels and Tales* 21(1):127–40.

Schmidt, Sigrid. 1991. *Aschenputtel und Eulenspiegel in Afrika. Entlehntes Erzählgut der Nama and Damara in Namibia*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

Schweizer, Niklaus R. 1988. Kahaunani: "Snowwhite" in Hawaiian: A Study in Acculturation. In *East Meets West: Homage to Edgar C. Knowlton, Jr.*, ed. Roger L. Hadlich and J. D. Ellsworth, pp. 283–9. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Scot, Reginald. [1584] 1972. *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*. New York: Dover.

Seljamaa, Elo-Hanna. 2007. Towards a Normal Science of Folklore: Walter Anderson and the Law of Self-Correction. Paper presented at Reflecting on Knowledge Production conference, Tartu, Estonia, May 17–19, 2007.

Sercambi, Giovanni. [1374] 1972. *Giovanni Sercambi: Novelle*, ed. Giovanni Sinicropi. Bari, Italy: Gius, Laterza, and Figli.

———. [1374] 1974. *Giovanni Sercambi: Il Novelliere*, ed. Luciano Rossi. Rome: Salerno Editrice.

Soriano, Marc. 1977. *Les Contes de Perrault: Culture savant et tradition populaire*. Paris: Gallimard.

Strabo. 1915. *The Geography*, trans. H. C. Hamilton and W. Falconer. London: G. Bell.

Straker, Jay. 2008. Performing the Predicaments of National Belonging: The Art and Politics of the Tuareg Ensemble Tartit at the 2003 Folklife Festival. *Journal of American Folklore* 121(479):80–96.

Straparola, Giovanni Francesco. [1551–1553] 1898. *The Facetious Nights of Giovanni Francesco Straparola*, trans. and ed. W. G. Waters. 4 vols. London: Society of Bibliophiles.

———. [1551–1553] 2000. *Le piacevoli notti*, ed. Donato Pirovano. Rome: Salerno Editrice.

Sumpter, Caroline. 2008. *The Victorian Press and the Fairy Tale*. London: Palgrave.

Tanhuma. 1989. *Midrash Tanhuma*, trans. John T. Townsend. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav.

Thompson, Stith. [1946] 1977. *The Folktale*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Uther, Hans-Jörg. 1990. *Märchen vor Grimm*. Munich: E. Diederichs.

———. 2004. *The Types of International Folktales: A Classification and Bibliography*. 3 vols. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Vinaver, Eugène. 1971. *The Rise of Romance*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Voigt, Vilmos. 2002. Propp, Vladimir Kakovkevič. In *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, vol. 10, cols. 1435–42. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Walsham, Alexandra. 2008. The Reformation and "The Disenchantment of the World" Reassessed. *Historical Journal* 51(2):497–528.

Wesselski, Albert. 1925. *Märchen des Mittelalters*. Berlin: Herbert Stubenrauch Verlagsbuchhandlung.

———. [1931] 1974. *Versuch einer Theorie des Märchens*. Prager deutsche Studien 45. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg.

Wettengel, Wolfgang. 2006. Die ägyptische Erzählung von den zwei Brüdern: Eine Literaturwerk im Kontext der Ramessidenzeit. *Fabula* 47(1–2):1–16.

Williams, Megan K. 2009. The Piacevoli Notti of Giambattista Casali: Diplomats, Families, and Fairy Tales in Cinquecento Italy. Paper presented at the conference of the Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America, April 15, 2009.

Wolfzettel, Dietrich. 2005. *Le Conte en palimpsest: Studien zur Funktion von Märchen und Mythos im französischen Mittelalter*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Ziolkowski, Jan. 2007. *Fairy Tales from Before Fairy Tales*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Zipes, Jack. 2001. *The Great Fairy Tale Tradition: From Straparola and Basile to the Brothers Grimm*. New York: Norton.

Zolkover, Adam. 2007. Orality and Literacy in the European Fairy Tale. *ISFNR Newsletter* 2:25–6.

Zumwalt, Rosemary. 1988. *American Folklore Scholarship: A Dialogue of Dissent*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.